



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 14, 2010

No. 88

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HINOJOSA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 14, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RUBÉN HINOJOSA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, ever-present to the least in our midst, increase our awareness that You are with us as a Nation. Today we celebrate America's unity and purpose, symbolized by the flag of the United States of America.

Through all our wars, international misunderstandings, and natural disasters, over the dust and destruction, we rejoice when we see this flag wave in noble rescue and recovery.

On this Flag Day, we take pride as American women and men in military service hoist this flag on ships at sea, on national bases, or in campgrounds around the world.

We are humbled as senior citizens salute and children pledge with their hearts in classrooms or any citizen with hand over heart is moved by a parade of this flag.

Across this land this year, Lord, increase intelligent patriotism and honest dialogue, as You keep at bay fear, cynicism, and a lack of virtue.

With strong voice let America pledge itself anew to a oneness that builds a spirit-filled people committed to bring liberty to all and peace to the world both now and ever, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRIGHT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 11, 2010 at 10:19 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 3360.

Appointments:
United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Friday, June 11, 2010:

S. 3473, to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to authorize advances from Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

WHO IS THE WHITE HOUSE TO GIVE ADVICE ON BORDER SECURITY?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Israel actually believes in and secures

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4389

its border from criminals, terrorists and anyone else trying to illegally sneak into Israel for any purpose. Israel doesn't allow ships to go into the terrorist-run area of Gaza without first being searched for contraband.

However, in light of the recent unsuccessful attempt of six ships to run the Israeli blockade into Hamas-controlled Gaza and in an apparent attempt to placate the Palestinians, the White House is giving Israel advice on border security. "Don't be so tough," seems to be the message. If Israel followed America's border security plan, they would be crippled by terrorist attacks. If Israel followed America's border security plan, they would be overrun by rock-throwing illegals, drug smugglers, human traffickers, and increased border violence. Anyway, it's none of our business what Israel does. And who are we to give advice?

America needs to be more concerned about our own disastrous border security than giving anyone else bad advice about their border security.

And that's just the way it is.

ADOPT A BUDGET, AND THEN KEEP IT

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, we are setting new records here in this Congress and in this government. We are now approaching, if we haven't already leaped over it, the \$14 trillion mark for the national debt.

Fourteen trillion dollars. It doesn't just kind of trip off your tongue. It's a huge number. It's a number that is difficult to contemplate. And yet we sit here, working very diligently on suspension calendar bills, doing virtually nothing about the national debt except adding to it day after day after day.

If you were to have a household income, and you were trying to determine what to do with your debt, it seems to me the first thing you would do is you would adopt a budget. You would adopt a budget to try and figure out your income, your expenses, how much debt you could have. But we have been informed by the majority that we're not even going to start with that this year. We are going to forget about even coming up with a budget, I guess because we're so embarrassed about the numbers that would be in there.

Let's at least do what families do: adopt a budget and then keep it.

ADMINISTRATION AWOL ON OIL SPILL

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it took President Obama 12 days to visit the gulf coast oil spill. In contrast,

President Bush visited New Orleans just 4 days after Hurricane Katrina; yet the national media harshly criticized his response as being too slow.

For more than a month, the Obama administration said that BP was responsible for stopping the oil. Finally, during the President's first news conference in 10 months, he said, "I take responsibility. It is my job to make sure that everything is done to shut this down."

Tomorrow the President finally will address the country to discuss the oil spill. The national media should hold the Obama administration to the same standard they did the Bush administration. Anything less shows a partisan bias.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1368) supporting the goals of National Dairy Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1368

Whereas since 1939, June has been celebrated as National Dairy Month;

Whereas there are nearly 70,000 dairy farms throughout the United States, and approximately 99 percent of these farms are family owned;

Whereas the dairy industry in the United States produces more than 170 billion pounds of milk annually and contributes tens of billions of dollars to the economy;

Whereas dairy products are an important source of calcium and have been long recognized as an integral part of a healthy diet for both children and adults;

Whereas dairy farmers are significant contributors to efforts to preserve farmland and the rural character of communities across the country; and

Whereas the dairy industry has faced significant challenges recently due to high production costs and low retail prices, which has forced many farms to close: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of National Dairy Month;

(2) encourages States and local governments to observe National Dairy Month with appropriate activities and events that promote the dairy industry;

(3) recognizes the important role that the dairy industry has played in the economic and nutritional well-being of Americans;

(4) commends dairy farmers for their continued hard work and commitment to the

United States economy and to the preservation of open space; and

(5) encourages all Americans to show their continued support for the dairy industry and dairy farmers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 1368.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The resolution we are considering today supports the goals of National Dairy Month, recognizes the importance of our dairy industry and commends dairy farmers for their continued hard work. Our Nation's 57,000 dairy farms provide healthy, nutritious milk and dairy products to families across the country. The products produced by our Nation's dairy farmers provide the nutrients necessary to support a healthy lifestyle and ensure our children and grandchildren grow healthy and strong.

The U.S. dairy industry produces 189 billion pounds of milk annually and contributes tens of billions of dollars to our economy. The House Agriculture Committee has recently held farm bill hearings across the country where Members have had the opportunity to hear from our Nation's dairy producers. Like too many in our Nation, dairy farmers are facing difficult times. Production costs remain high, but retail prices are low, and the credit farmers need to stay in business is difficult to find.

As we begin the process of writing a new farm bill, I am hopeful that we can work with our Nation's dairy farmers to develop new policies that will provide a better safety net that will ensure they can continue to meet our dairy needs and play a vital role in our Nation's economy. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution today to support the goals of National Dairy Month.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1368, supporting the goals of National Dairy Month, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 70 years, we have celebrated the month of June as National Dairy Month. Today it is particularly important to recognize the efforts of the hardworking men and women in the dairy industry.

The 19th Congressional District is one of the fastest growing dairy regions in the Nation, but many dairy

producers from west Texas and the big country are concerned about low milk prices and rising production costs that are making it difficult for these operations to survive.

Dairy products, like milk, cheese and ice cream, contain essential nutrients, including calcium, and potassium. These products may help to reduce your risk for high blood pressure, osteoporosis, and certain cancers. National Dairy Month is a great opportunity to get together with friends and family and celebrate an industry that provides nutritional value to our lives and is an important part of many local economies.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge the efforts that are underway within the National Milk Producers Federation. They are working to develop policy proposals to address the current crisis that have affected the profitability of nearly every dairy farm in this country. While I may not agree with each of their policy recommendations, I do appreciate the forward thinking and innovative approach that they are taking.

However, despite these efforts, it is likely that whatever we do to "fix" the dairy policy will be negatively offset as a result of other policies advocated by this administration and the Democratic leadership in Congress. Whether we are talking about the cap-and-tax bill or the growing list of regulatory proposals being advanced at the EPA and other Federal agencies, there doesn't seem to be any limit on the costs this administration is willing to impose on big businesses or small businesses around this country. We need to empower businesses large and small to create jobs and have long-term profitability instead of burdening them with new regulations and taxes that prevent long-term business planning.

As we celebrate the accomplishments of America's dairy industry this month, I am hopeful that my colleagues will agree that in order to sustain the long-term profitability of this or any other agricultural enterprise steps need to be taken to curb the efforts by this administration and the Democratic leadership that threaten our industry, our economy and our prosperity. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1368, Supporting the Goals of National Dairy Month. This resolution recognizes and honors America's dairy farmers who serve as a critical component of our economy—especially throughout my district in Southeastern and East Central Ohio. I commend Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member LUCAS for their attention to this major and important industry in our country.

In recent years, our dairy farmers have struggled as the result of an economic downturn and price fluctuations in the market, and this is a problem that I have been working to address. To protect our farmers, we absolutely need to do everything we can to bring more stability to this crucial industry. In my District, dairy farmers are a keystone of our economy,

and this Resolution highlights the need to recognize them as an industry that needs our assistance.

In rural Ohio—and rural America as a whole—the agricultural industry is a backbone of our culture, our society, and our economy; as such, we need to ensure that our local dairy farms are protected. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this Resolution that honors such an important element of our food supply and our economy.

Again, I wish to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their work on this legislation. I also want to thank Congressman COURTNEY for his introduction of the Resolution.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Dairy Month and the hard working men and women who are involved in this great industry. As I grew up on a dairy farm, I have a very keen appreciation for those who work the extremely hard and long hours needed to produce milk products. The dairy industry is vital to the United States economy and an integral part of the economies of California and its 21st Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent.

In California alone, dairy is a \$47 billion industry employing over 400,000 people. The state is responsible for 21.3 percent of the U.S. milk supply, with my hometown of Tulare County leading the nation in milk production. In fact, it represents 5.3 percent of total U.S. production and generates \$1.69 billion in sales according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture. Together with Fresno County, which I also represent, these two counties account for over 33.7 percent of California's milk production and generated just under 7 billion pounds of milk in the first six months of 2009.

The dairy industry has long played a crucial role in the economic and nutritional well-being of all Americans. My constituents are innovative agriculturists who are constantly looking for ways to further the growth and success of the industry. Moreover, the United States dairy industry is instrumental to the preservation of farmland and forms the backbone of many rural communities. Thus, I encourage my colleagues and all Americans to show their continued support for the dairy industry.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1368.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1415

HONORING DR. LARRY CASE ON HIS RETIREMENT AS NATIONAL FFA ADVISOR

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1383) honoring Dr. Larry Case on his retirement as National FFA Advisor.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1383

Whereas, on May 3, 2010, the U.S. Department of Education announced the retirement of National FFA Advisor Dr. Larry Case, effective January 1, 2011, after 26 years of service in that capacity;

Whereas a former FFA member from Stet, Missouri, Dr. Case earned his bachelor's degree in agricultural education, master's degree in vocational education, and doctor of education from the University of Missouri;

Whereas Dr. Case began his career in 1966 as a high school agricultural education instructor in Mendon, Missouri;

Whereas Dr. Case served as the Missouri director of agricultural education for seven years;

Whereas in 1984, Dr. Case left Missouri for Washington, DC, where he became the senior program specialist and coordinator for agricultural and rural education;

Whereas in addition to serving as the National FFA Advisor, Dr. Case served as the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the National FFA organization and Board President of the National FFA Foundation Board of Trustees;

Whereas in addition to helping form the National Council for Agricultural Education, Dr. Case also served as National Advisor to the National Young Farmer Educational Association, National Advisor and Chairman of the Board for the National Postsecondary Student Organization, and Chairman of the National Council for Vocational and Technical Education in Agriculture;

Whereas during his tenure, FFA saw tremendous growth in membership and educational innovation, and was able to personally congratulate more than 50,000 young FFA leaders; and

Whereas Dr. Case has provided agricultural education and the FFA with strong leadership and a strategic vision for the future, and agriculture owes him a debt of gratitude for his good work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors Dr. Larry Case on his retirement as National FFA Advisor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution, H. Res. 1383.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us recognizes the outstanding

service of Dr. Larry Case who has served as the National FFA Advisor for the past 26 years.

Since 1928, the National FFA Organization, which was known as the Future Farmers of America until 1988, has provided leadership, career development, and agriculture education programs to young Americans.

Under Dr. Case's leadership, the organization has evolved to continue meeting the diverse needs of young Americans through agricultural education. Throughout his career, Dr. Case has distinguished himself as a visionary in this area. As the organization now claims more than 500,000 members, Dr. Case has led FFA as it prepares the next generation of leaders who will guide our country by the FFA motto: Learning to Do, Doing to Learn, Earning to Live, Living to Serve.

We congratulate Dr. Case on the occasion of his retirement, we thank him for his service, and we wish him and his family all the best as he enters this new phase in his life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution to honor Dr. Larry Case upon his retirement as National FFA Advisor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1383, honoring the contributions and the retirement of National FFA Advisor Dr. Larry Case. This is the time of year when we see FFA members in our Nation's Capitol wearing the symbolic blue and gold jackets. These students are the future of American agriculture. We are grateful to Dr. Case, as well as local and State FFA advisors across the country, for educating and encouraging these students to develop lifelong skills in the field of agriculture. In fact, two of my current staff members are former FFA chapter presidents.

With more than 500,000 members, the National FFA Organization is one of the largest youth organizations in the world. For 26 years, Dr. Case has served as the national advisor. The National FFA Organization mission statement is to make a positive difference in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth and career success through agricultural education.

During his tenure, Dr. Case has led this organization in tremendous membership growth, promoted the importance of agriculture education, and helped empower countless individuals to build a brighter future for agriculture.

Dr. Case's involvement with FFA began when he was a member in Stet, Missouri. He later chose to pursue his agriculture education degree at the University of Missouri. In 1966, he began his career as an agriculture education instructor. Since that time, he has taught numerous students valuable leadership skills while learning about

the importance of the U.S. agriculture industry.

We appreciate Dr. Case's tireless dedication, service, and leadership, and we wish him well on his retirement in January. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1383.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 1383, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1383.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1409) expressing support for designation of June 20, 2010, as "American Eagle Day", and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1409

Whereas, on June 20, 1782, the bald eagle was officially designated as the national emblem of the United States by the founding fathers at the Second Continental Congress;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States;

Whereas the image of the bald eagle is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

- (1) the Office of the President;
- (2) the Office of the Vice President;
- (3) Congress;
- (4) the Supreme Court;
- (5) the Department of the Treasury;
- (6) the Department of Defense;
- (7) the Department of Justice;
- (8) the Department of State;
- (9) the Department of Commerce;
- (10) the Department of Homeland Security;
- (11) the Department of Veterans Affairs;
- (12) the Department of Labor;
- (13) the Department of Health and Human Services;
- (14) the Department of Energy;
- (15) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;
- (16) the Central Intelligence Agency; and
- (17) the Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of—

- (1) the spirit of freedom; and
- (2) the democracy of the United States;

Whereas, since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the bald eagle have played a significant role in the art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and culture of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is prominently featured on the stamps, currency, and coinage of the United States;

Whereas the habitat of bald eagles exists only in North America;

Whereas, by 1963, the population of bald eagles that nested in the lower 48 States had declined to approximately 417 nesting pairs;

Whereas, due to the dramatic decline in the population of bald eagles in the lower 48 States, the Secretary of the Interior listed the bald eagle as an endangered species on the list of endangered species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas caring and concerned individuals from the Federal, State, and private sectors banded together to save, and help ensure the recovery and protection of, bald eagles;

Whereas, on July 20, 1969, the first manned lunar landing occurred in the Apollo 11 Lunar Excursion Module, which was named "Eagle";

Whereas the "Eagle" played an integral role in achieving the goal of the United States of landing a man on the Moon and returning that man safely to Earth;

Whereas, in 1995, as a result of the efforts of those caring and concerned individuals, the Secretary of the Interior listed the bald eagle as a threatened species on the list of threatened species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas, by 2007, the population of bald eagles that nested in the lower 48 States had increased to approximately 10,000 nesting pairs, an increase of approximately 2,500 percent from the preceding 40 years;

Whereas, in 2007, the population of bald eagles that nested in the State of Alaska was approximately 50,000 to 70,000;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary of the Interior removed the bald eagle from the list of threatened species published under section 4(c)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(1));

Whereas bald eagles remain protected in accordance with—

(1) the Act of June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.) (commonly known as the "Bald Eagle Protection Act of 1940"); and

(2) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

Whereas, on January 15, 2008, the Secretary of the Treasury issued 3 limited edition bald eagle commemorative coins under the American Bald Eagle Recovery and National Emblem Commemorative Coin Act (Public Law 108-486; 118 Stat. 3934);

Whereas the sale of the limited edition bald eagle commemorative coins issued by the Secretary of the Treasury has raised approximately \$7,800,000 for the nonprofit American Eagle Foundation of Pigeon Forge, Tennessee to support efforts to protect the bald eagle;

Whereas, if not for the vigilant conservation efforts of concerned Americans and the enactment of strict environmental protection laws (including regulations), the bald eagle would probably be extinct;

Whereas the American Eagle Foundation has brought substantial public attention to the cause of the protection and care of the bald eagle nationally;

Whereas November 4, 2010, marks the 25th anniversary of the American Eagle Foundation;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the population of bald eagles—

(1) is an endangered species success story; and

(2) an inspirational example for other wildlife and natural resource conservation efforts around the world;

Whereas the initial recovery of the population of bald eagles was accomplished by the concerted efforts of numerous government agencies, corporations, organizations, and individuals;

Whereas June 20, 2010, would be an appropriate date to designate as "American Eagle Day"; and

Whereas the continuation of recovery, management, and public awareness programs for bald eagles will be necessary to ensure—

(1) the continued progress of the recovery of bald eagles; and

(2) that the population and habitat of bald eagles will remain healthy and secure for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of "American Eagle Day";

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of the Treasury as a means by which to generate critical funds for the protection of bald eagles; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1409, expressing support for the designation of June 20, 2010, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

The American bald eagle has been a part of American culture for hundreds of years. In 1782, the Second Continental Congress established that the bald eagle was the official emblem of the United States because of its uniqueness to North America. It can be seen on the United States seals in public buildings, in schools and even here in the House Chamber. Over the years, the bald eagle has become a living symbol of the United States spirit, freedom, and continual pursuit of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, the bald eagle was on the endangered species list a little

more than 45 years ago with only 400 nesting pairs in the whole United States. Through conservation, education and careful planning, the American bald eagle has thrived. As a result, the Department of the Interior has taken the bald eagle off both the endangered and threatened species list. The bald eagle has been a national symbol, and its recovery has been a national success story.

House Resolution 1409 will not only honor the now-thriving American bald eagle, it will also encourage support of the United States Mint Bald Eagle Commemorative Coin program, which has been a success for the past few years.

I want to acknowledge all that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and his staff, Matt Meyer, have done to bring attention to the American bald eagle and commend Congressman DAVID ROE for introducing this very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the American bald eagle is indeed an American icon. I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting H. Res. 1409.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1409, designating June 20, 2010, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of our Nation's symbol, the bald eagle.

The Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress designated the bald eagle as our national emblem June 20, 1782, and its image has played a significant role in the culture of the United States ever since.

However, the bird's survival was in question with only approximately 417 nesting pairs remaining in the continental U.S. in 1963. The Department of the Interior had them listed as an endangered species.

Concentrated efforts to save our symbol of freedom have been successful. The latest numbers estimate 10,000 nesting pairs in the lower 48 States and 50,000 to 70,000 bald eagles nesting in Alaska. The bird has been removed from the threatened species list and is thriving.

As we celebrate the eagle's recovery, I want to take time to recognize the efforts of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee. This group brings national attention to the cause of the protection and care of the bald eagle. The foundation has raised nearly \$8 million for protection efforts through the sale of commemorative coins issued by the U.S. Treasury and should be commended for their continued success.

Mr. Speaker, I remember as a young boy and as a youngster growing up in Tennessee, I never saw a bald eagle. And today, throughout the entire State you can go and people can visit and see bald eagles and it is really exhilarating to be on a lake or be out hiking in the

woods and see these magnificent animals. I recall a trip I took some years ago fishing in Alaska, I looked up and I counted 12 bald eagles—and they were much better at fishing than I was. It is terrific what these folks have done in Tennessee to help maintain this wonderful animal. I thank the Congress for considering this resolution, and the gentleman from Texas for his kind words.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H. Res. 1409, designating June 20, 2010 as "American Eagle Day," in recognition of the recovery of the American bald eagle from near extinction in the 1960s. The bald eagle, our national bird, is a majestic animal and its symbolic importance in many aspects of United States history and government makes it richly deserving of celebration.

Although an estimated 500,000 bald eagles lived in North America in the 1700s, only 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remained in the lower 48 states by 1963. This was an abhorrent environmental tragedy and a blow to the national psyche. Thankfully, due to dedicated conservation efforts over the last 40 years, the bald eagle was officially removed from the U.S. List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife in 2007, and its total population is now more than 100,000.

The full recovery of the bald eagle from the threat of extinction in the U.S. is a source of inspiration to those who hope to conserve wildlife and save endangered species. Furthermore, I applaud the use of funds from the sale of bald eagle commemorative coins to continue rebuilding the bald eagle population and raising awareness of the bald eagle. My hope is that, with the support of Congress, the bald eagle need never again face neglect, and will continue to be celebrated by future generations.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1409.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXTENDING EFFECTIVE DATE OF GIFT CARD PROVISIONS OF CREDIT CARD LAW

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5502) to amend the effective date

of the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5502

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE.

Title IV of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act, is amended by striking section 403 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b) of this section, this title and the amendments made by this title shall become effective 15 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a gift certificate, store gift card, or general-use prepaid card that was produced prior to April 1, 2010, the effective date of the disclosure requirements described in sections 915(b)(3) and (c)(2)(B) of the Electronic Funds Transfer Act shall be January 31, 2011, provided that an issuer of such a certificate or card shall—

“(A) comply with paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 915(b) of such Act;

“(B) consider any such certificate or card for which funds expire to have no expiration date with respect to the underlying funds;

“(C) at a consumer’s request, replace such certificate or card that has funds remaining at no cost to the consumer; and

“(D) comply with the disclosure requirements of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

“(2) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The disclosure requirements of this subsection are met by providing notice to consumers, via in-store signage, messages during customer service calls, Web sites, and general advertising, that—

“(A) any such certificate or card for which funds expire shall be deemed to have no expiration date with respect to the underlying funds;

“(B) consumers holding such certificate or card shall have a right to a free replacement certificate or card that includes the packaging and materials, typically associated with such a certificate or card; and

“(C) any dormancy fee, inactivity fee, or service fee for such certificates or cards that might otherwise be charged shall not be charged if such fees do not comply with section 915 of the Electronic Funds Transfer Act.

“(3) PERIOD FOR DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The notice requirements in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall continue until January 31, 2013.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1430

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5502, legislation that extends the effective date of the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Act of 2009 to January 31, 2011, 15 months after enactment of the Credit Card Act.

On March 23, 2010, the Federal Reserve Board issued final rules implementing the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Act of 2009. These rules, which appropriately restrict gift card fees and expiration dates, offer important protections for consumers. The rules become effective on August 22, 2010, just prior to the start of the 2010 holiday season. Because of the timing of the effective date of the rules and the approaching holiday season, as well as the technical disclosure requirements set forth in the Credit Card Act of 2009, millions of gift cards currently in the stream of commerce will be out of compliance with this law’s disclosure provisions unless we pass this bill.

The challenges presented to retailers who rely on the sales of gift cards would be significant, as they would likely be faced with empty gift card displays for a period of time while the cards are removed, while they are destroyed and reproduced and redisplayed. And most importantly, Mr. Speaker, customers would be inconvenienced and dissatisfied.

Several of us here in Congress believe this is contrary to congressional intent contemplated when Congress passed the Credit Card Act of 2009 or when the Federal Reserve Board issued its final rules. Such waste and destruction is unnecessary, especially in light of the fact that there is an existing rule in place that the industry would be compliant with as it sold off existing inventory. A reasonable transition period is needed to sell through current card inventory and comply with the disclosure provisions in the final rules to serve consumers, to mitigate environmental impact, and reduce substantial costs incurred by the prepaid card industry and sellers, many of which are small businesses. Extending the gift card provisions by 15 months will address all of these concerns.

I want to take this opportunity to commend my colleague Congressman DAN MAFFEI of New York, as well as Jillian Martin on his staff, for authoring this important legislation and ensuring that it complies with all the other requirements in the Credit Card Act of 2009.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5502 is a common-sense change to the CARD Act, which passed last year. This bill would provide a short extension for certain disclosure requirements associated with gift certificates, store gift cards, and

general-use prepaid cards produced prior to April 1, 2010. It is important to note that nothing in this bill rolls back or changes any of the underlying CARD Act protections.

The thrust behind H.R. 5502 is to avoid unnecessary waste, both in terms of time and the environment, which would occur if the implementation date for certain disclosure requirements is not shifted from August 2010 until January 2011. Without this sensible change, issuers would have to recall hundreds of millions of cards that they have already produced.

It is a virtually incomprehensible amount of waste. But to try to understand the amount of waste that would result without this change, picture eight football fields that are 12 feet deep full of unused and unusable cards. There is no reason to allow such a result. Insisting on such an unreasonable implementation date is just inappropriate, especially when there is something we can do about it.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H.R. 5502, and thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this to the floor.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5502 and commend my colleague Representative DAN MAFFEI for his leadership on this bill.

The gift card provisions were part of the Credit Card Act that I sponsored and the President signed in May, 2009. The Fed was directed to promulgate rules associated with the provisions and I fully support the rules that the Fed adopted. However, many companies that issue cards whose funds do not expire will have to remove gift cards from store shelves that will be out of compliance starting August 22 when the provisions become effective.

Replacing these cards entails not only the production of sufficient new cards to replace in-store inventory, but the additional cost of restocking retailers and pulling all noncompliant cards off the shelf and destroying them.

A short transition period will allow the companies who issue cards with non-expiring funds to sell through their existing card stock on store shelves during the holiday season without having to discard and destroy 100 million cards. It is estimated that this volume would take up more than eight football fields buried 12 feet deep in such cards.

I wrote to the Fed, along with several of my colleagues, asking that they extend the compliance date to January of 2011. However, the Fed felt that since they had been directed to promulgate the rules, they did not want to preempt Congress’s authority. This bill will codify the request I made to the Fed in my letter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill so that it can become law before the August 22 implementation date.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5502.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TONKO) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 1368, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1409, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5502, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on House Resolution 1383 will resume later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1368) supporting the goals of National Dairy Month, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 0, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

YEAS—359

Ackerman	Altmire	Baca
Aderholt	Andrews	Bachmann
Adler (NJ)	Arcuri	Bachus
Alexander	Austria	Baird

Baldwin	Flake	Markey (MA)
Barrow	Fleming	Marshall
Bartlett	Poster	Matsui
Barton (TX)	Poxx	McCarthy (CA)
Bean	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Berkley	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Berman	Fudge	McCollum
Berry	Gallagher	McCotter
Biggert	Garamendi	McDermott
Bilbray	Giffords	McGovern
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Bishop (GA)	Gohmert	McIntyre
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	McKeon
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	McMahon
Blackburn	Granger	McMorris
Blumenauer	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Blunt	Grayson	McNerney
Bocchieri	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Boehner	Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)
Bono Mack	Griffith	Mica
Boren	Guthrie	Michaud
Boswell	Hall (NY)	Miller (MI)
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Miller (NC)
Boustany	Halvorson	Miller, Gary
Braley (IA)	Hare	Miller, George
Bright	Harman	Minnick
Broun (GA)	Harper	Mitchell
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Ginny	Hastings (WA)	Moore (KS)
Buchanan	Heinrich	Moore (WI)
Burgess	Heller	Moran (VA)
Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Murphy (CT)
Buyer	Herger	Murphy (NY)
Calvert	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick
Camp	Higgins	Murphy, Tim
Cantor	Himes	Nadler (NY)
Capito	Hincheey	Neal (MA)
Capps	Hinojosa	Neugebauer
Capuano	Hirono	Nye
Cardoza	Holt	Oberstar
Carney	Hoyer	Obey
Carson (IN)	Hunter	Olson
Cassidy	Israel	Olver
Castle	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Owens
Chaffetz	(TX)	Pallone
Chandler	Jenkins	Pascarella
Childers	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Chu	Johnson (IL)	Paul
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Cleaver	Jones	Pence
Clyburn	Jordan (OH)	Perlmutter
Coble	Kagen	Perriello
Coffman (CO)	Kanjorski	Peters
Cohen	Kaptur	Peterson
Cole	Kennedy	Petri
Conaway	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Connolly (VA)	Kilroy	Pitts
Conyers	Kind	Platts
Cooper	King (IA)	Poe (TX)
Courtney	King (NY)	Polis (CO)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Pomeroy
Critz	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Posey
Crowley	Kissell	Price (GA)
Cuellar	Klein (FL)	Price (NC)
Culberson	Kline (MN)	Putnam
Cummings	Kosmas	Rahall
Dahlkemper	Kratovil	Rangel
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rehberg
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Reichert
Davis (TN)	Lance	Reyes
DeFazio	Langevin	Richardson
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)
Dent	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Deutch	LaTourette	Rooney
Diaz-Balart, M.	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Lee (CA)	Roskam
Dingell	Lee (NY)	Ross
Djou	Levin	Rothman (NJ)
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Doyle	Linder	Ruppersberger
Dreier	LoBiondo	Rush
Driehaus	Loeback	Ryan (OH)
Duncan	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (WI)
Edwards (MD)	Lowey	Sanchez, Linda
Edwards (TX)	Lucas	T.
Ehlers	Lujan	Sarbanes
Ellison	Lummis	Scalise
Ellsworth	Lungren, Daniel	Schakowsky
Emerson	E.	Schauer
Engel	Mack	Schiff
Eshoo	Maffei	Schmidt
Etheridge	Manzullo	Schock
Farr	Marchant	Schrader
Filner	Markey (CO)	Schwartz

Scott (GA)	Stearns	Velázquez
Scott (VA)	Stupak	Visclosky
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Walden
Serrano	Sutton	Walz
Sessions	Teague	Wasserman
Sestak	Terry	Schultz
Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Watson
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Watt
Sherman	Thompson (PA)	Waxman
Shimkus	Thornberry	Welch
Shuster	Tiahrt	Westmoreland
Smith (NE)	Tiberi	Whitfield
Smith (NJ)	Tierney	Wilson (OH)
Smith (TX)	Titus	Wittman
Smith (WA)	Tonko	Wolf
Snyder	Tsongas	Woolsey
Space	Turner	Wu
Speier	Upton	Young (AK)
Spratt	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—72

Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Napolitano
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Nunes
Bonner	Gordon (TN)	Quigley
Boozman	Grijalva	Radanovich
Boyd	Gutierrez	Rogers (KY)
Brady (PA)	Hill	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hodes	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Holden	Sanchez, Loretta
Butterfield	Honda	Shuler
Campbell	Inglis	Simpson
Cao	Inslee	Sires
Carnahan	Issa	Skelton
Carter	Kilpatrick (MI)	Slaughter
Costa	Kirk	Stark
Costello	Lipinski	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Towns
Delahunt	Maloney	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	Waters
Fallin	Melancon	Weiner
Fattah	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Yarmuth
Fortenberry	Myrick	Young (FL)

□ 1858

Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 355. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 1368, Supporting the Goals of National Dairy Month, which will commend dairy farmers for their hard work and commitment to the U.S. economy and preservation of open space.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 355, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC., June 10, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Mr. Wesley B. Taylor, Director of Elections, Office of the Secretary of State, State of Georgia, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held June 8, 2010, the Honorable Tom

Graves was elected Representative to Congress for the Ninth Congressional District, State of Georgia.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

THE OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF
STATE,

June 10, 2010.

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
*Clerk, House of Representatives, H-154 U.S.
Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. MILLER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election Runoff held on Tuesday, June 8, 2010, for U.S. Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia show that, as of today's date, Tom Graves received 22,684 votes or 56.5% of the total number of votes cast, and thus far counted, for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Tom Graves was elected as the U.S. Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia.

At this time, we are not aware of any contest to this election. As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved, the official "Certificate of Election" will be prepared and forwarded to the Governor's Office for transmittal to you as required by Georgia law.

If we can assist you further, please let us know.

Sincerely,

WESLEY B. TAILOR.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE TOM GRAVES, OF GEORGIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable Tom Graves, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect GRAVES and the members of the Georgia delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 111th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE TOM GRAVES TO THE HOUSE OF REP- RESENTATIVES

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, it's a great honor to introduce TOM GRAVES, the newest member of the Georgia delegation and, obviously, the newest Member of the United States Congress. TOM comes to us from the Ninth District of Georgia, the seat which was held by Nathan Deal. And we all miss Nathan. He was a leading voice on Medicaid and immigration issues. And I know that TOM will continue that fight for the people of the Ninth District of Georgia.

TOM comes from Ranger, Georgia. You may not know Ranger, Georgia, population 91, but it's a little bit down the road from Red Bud, Georgia, which isn't incorporated, and not too far from Fairmount, Georgia. The three of them collectively are near nothing at all. They are in Gordon County.

Now, TOM served for 7½ years in the Georgia General Assembly and was on the Transportation, Health and Human Services Committee and the Ways and Means Committee. He was a leader in job creation for the State of Georgia, and with his JOBS Act, introduced in 2009, he worked for pro-growth legislation—legislation that would phase out the corporate income tax and eliminate the burdensome inventory tax for Georgia businesses. For this, he was recognized by ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council, to which many of us once belonged. He was nominated and earned the title of Legislator of the Year.

TOM has also been recognized by the National Federation of Independent Businesses as the Guardian of Small Business and by the Georgia Retail Association for being Legislator of the Year, and was one of only two State legislators in the country to be selected by FreedomWorks Foundation to receive the Legislative Entrepreneurial Award.

TOM, we're very glad to have you. But we're also especially glad to have your wife, Julie, who's sitting up in the gallery. TOM also has his three children with him today: JoAnn, John, and Janey. And we're glad that you're going to share your daddy with us.

TOM is well known back home for having a beautiful family and a very ugly pickup truck. But he is committed to the truck. He's had it for 13 years—and he thought that was a long time. But I want to introduce you to GARY ACKERMAN, who will tell you how to really take care of a car, which I think now is going on 30 years old.

TOM, I also want to tell my friends CLIFF STEARNS and CORRINE BROWN, who come from a State that likes to pretend like they play football, that TOM Graves is a Georgia Bulldog. We can always use one more in the world. So if any of you people from Florida want to convert, it would be a good time.

TOM, we welcome you to the greatest body, the greatest legislative body the world has ever seen: the United States Congress.

With that, I want to yield to my good friend, Mr. JOHN LEWIS, the dean of our delegation.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, JACK KINGSTON, for yielding me time.

As the dean of the Georgia delegation, it is my great pleasure to welcome TOM GRAVES to the United States House of Representatives. Mr. GRAVES is not a stranger to Georgia politics. He served in the Georgia State House of Representatives for almost 8 years. TOM, I not only welcome you, but I am proud to welcome your beautiful wife, Julie, and your three lovely and beautiful children.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Speaker and Congressman LEWIS, Congressman KINGSTON, thank you.

As we recognize Flag Day today, it's also a reminder of the greatness of this young Republic, the foundations for which it rests, and the opportunity that awaits.

As one who didn't grow up in wealth or politics but, really, quite the opposite—very simple beginnings in a single-wide trailer on a tar and gravel road in the backwoods of north Georgia—I am here now able to pay tribute to my parents who couldn't give me the material things in life but, instead, they showed me love and they encouraged me to dream big, to work hard, and achieve much.

And while I am standing before you today as a freshman Member, I am the freshest voice from the campaign trail. And the message from the hills of north Georgia to the Hill of this great building is very clear, and that is that it's time to curb spending. It's time to balance the budget, and it's time to empower the people.

While the challenges are great in this Nation, the will and the Constitution of her people are greater. And, you know, my dad was right. If we, as Americans, dream big, work hard, we can achieve much as a Nation.

So on behalf of Georgia Nine, Madam Speaker, I am here to go to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Georgia, the whole number of the House is 433.

SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to

the resolution (H. Res. 1409) expressing support for designation of June 20, 2010, as “American Eagle Day”, and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

YEAS—360

Ackerman	Cooper	Herger
Aderholt	Costa	Herseth Sandlin
Adler (NJ)	Courtney	Higgins
Akin	Crenshaw	Himes
Alexander	Critz	Hinchee
Altmire	Crowley	Hinojosa
Andrews	Cuellar	Hirono
Arcuri	Culberson	Holt
Austria	Cummings	Hoyer
Baca	Dahlkemper	Hunter
Bachmann	Davis (CA)	Israel
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	Davis (TN)	Jackson Lee
Barrow	DeFazio	(TX)
Bartlett	DeGette	Jenkins
Barton (TX)	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bean	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Becerra	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Berry	Dicks	Jones
Biggert	Dingell	Jordan (OH)
Bilbray	Djou	Kagen
Bilirakis	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	Kaptur
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Kennedy
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Kildee
Blackburn	Driehaus	Kilroy
Blumenauer	Duncan	Kind
Blunt	Edwards (MD)	King (IA)
Boccieri	Edwards (TX)	King (NY)
Boehner	Ehlers	Kingston
Bono Mack	Ellison	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boren	Ellsworth	Kissell
Boswell	Emerson	Klein (FL)
Boucher	Engel	Kline (MN)
Boustany	Eshoo	Kosmas
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kratovil
Bright	Farr	Kucinich
Broun (GA)	Filner	Lamborn
Brown-Waite,	Flake	Lance
Ginny	Fleming	Langevin
Buchanan	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Burgess	Fox	Larson (CT)
Burton (IN)	Frank (MA)	Latham
Buyer	Franks (AZ)	LaTourrette
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Camp	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Cantor	Gallegly	Lee (NY)
Capito	Garamendi	Levin
Capps	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Capuano	Giffords	Lewis (GA)
Cardoza	Gingrey (GA)	Linder
Carnahan	Gonzalez	LoBiondo
Carney	Goodlatte	Loeb
Carson (IN)	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Cassidy	Graves (GA)	Lowey
Castle	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Green, Al	Lujan
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lummis
Childers	Griffith	Lungren, Daniel
Chu	Guthrie	E.
Clarke	Hall (NY)	Mack
Clay	Hall (TX)	Maffei
Cleaver	Halvorson	Manzullo
Clyburn	Hare	Marchant
Coble	Harman	Markey (CO)
Coffman (CO)	Harper	Markey (MA)
Cohen	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Cole	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Conaway	Heinrich	McCarthy (CA)
Connolly (VA)	Heller	McCarthy (NY)
Conyers	Hensarling	McCaul

McClintock	Peters	Sestak
McCollum	Peterson	Shadegg
McCotter	Petri	Shea-Porter
McDermott	Pingree (ME)	Sherman
McGovern	Pitts	Shimkus
McHenry	Platts	Shuster
McIntyre	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
McKeon	Polis (CO)	Smith (NJ)
McMahon	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)
McMorris	Posey	Smith (WA)
Rodgers	Price (GA)	Snyder
McNerney	Price (NC)	Space
Meek (FL)	Putnam	Spratt
Meeks (NY)	Rahall	Stearns
Mica	Rangel	Stupak
Michaud	Rehberg	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Reichert	Sutton
Miller (NC)	Richardson	Teague
Miller, Gary	Rodriguez	Terry
Miller, George	Roe (TN)	Thompson (CA)
Minnick	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Mitchell	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Mollohan	Rooney	Thornberry
Moore (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Moore (WI)	Roskam	Tiberi
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tierney
Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Titus
Murphy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Murphy, Patrick	Royce	Tsongas
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Turner
Nadler (NY)	Rush	Upton
Neal (MA)	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Velázquez
Nye	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky
Oberstar	T.	Walz
Obey	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Olson	Scalise	Schultz
Oliver	Schakowsky	Watson
Ortiz	Schauer	Watt
Owens	Schiff	Waxman
Pallone	Schmidt	Welch
Pascarella	Schock	Westmoreland
Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Whitfield
Paul	Schwartz	Wilson (OH)
Paulsen	Scott (GA)	Wittman
Payne	Scott (VA)	Wolf
Pence	Sensenbrenner	Woolsey
Perlmutter	Serrano	Wu
Perriello	Sessions	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—72

Baird	Gohmert	Quigley
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Radanovich
Berman	Grijalva	Reyes
Bonner	Gutierrez	Rogers (KY)
Boozman	Hill	Rohrabacher
Boyd	Hodes	Salazar
Brady (PA)	Hoekstra	Sanchez, Loretta
Brady (TX)	Holden	Shuler
Brown (SC)	Honda	Simpson
Brown, Corrine	Inglis	Sires
Butterfield	Inslee	Skelton
Campbell	Issa	Slaughter
Cao	Kilpatrick (MI)	Speier
Carter	Kirk	Stark
Costello	Lipinski	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Taylor
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Towns
Delahunt	Matheson	Walden
Diaz-Balart, L.	Melancon	Wamp
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Waters
Fattah	Moran (KS)	Weiner
Forbes	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gerlach	Nunes	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1916

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 356. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 1409, Expressing support for designation of

June 20, 2010, as “American Eagle Day”, and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

REMEMBERING FLASH FLOOD VICTIMS

(Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of Friday, June 11, a sudden and devastating flash flood swept through the Albert Pike campground in southwest Arkansas. In just 4 short hours, the Little Missouri River along the Ouachita National Forest rose from 3 feet to 23 feet.

The flood swept away tents, RVs and homes, and, tragically, took 20 lives, including many children, making it one of Arkansas's deadliest flash floods in a generation. However, this tragedy's impact is far-reaching, as many of the victims were from surrounding States, including from Congressman HALL's district in Texas and from Congressman FLEMING's district in Louisiana. They join me here this evening as we remember those who died in this flood.

I also want to commend the outstanding work of our first responders—local, State, Federal—and fellow Arkansans who reacted without hesitation and rescued literally dozens of people from the debris and rushing waters. This weekend, I, along with Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack, U.S. Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell and Senators BLANCHE LINCOLN and MARK PRYOR, saw the devastation firsthand and spoke with families who lost loved ones.

My deepest thoughts and prayers and those of all Arkansans and all Americans are with the families who lost loved ones in these destructive flash floods.

Mr. Speaker, I join Congressman HALL and Congressman FLEMING in asking that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of each and every life we lost in this tragedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

EXTENDING EFFECTIVE DATE OF GIFT CARD PROVISIONS OF CREDIT CARD LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5502) to amend the effective date of the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 0, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

YEAS—357

Ackerman	DeLauro	King (NY)
Aderholt	Dent	Kingston
Adler (NJ)	Deutsch	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kissell
Alexander	Dicks	Klein (FL)
Altmire	Dingell	Kline (MN)
Andrews	Djou	Kosmas
Arcuri	Doggett	Kratovil
Austria	Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich
Baca	Doyle	Lamborn
Bachmann	Dreier	Lance
Bachus	Driebehaus	Langevin
Baldwin	Duncan	Larsen (WA)
Barrow	Edwards (MD)	Larson (CT)
Bartlett	Edwards (TX)	Latham
Barton (TX)	Ehlers	LaTourrette
Bean	Ellison	Latta
Becerra	Ellsworth	Lee (CA)
Berkley	Emerson	Lee (NY)
Berry	Engel	Levin
Biggert	Eshoo	Lewis (CA)
Billbray	Etheridge	Lewis (GA)
Bilirakis	Farr	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Filner	Loebsack
Bishop (NY)	Flake	Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Lowe
Blackburn	Foster	Lucas
Blumenauer	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Blunt	Frank (MA)	Lujan
Bocieri	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel E.
Bono Mack	Fudge	Mack
Boren	Gallegly	Maffei
Boswell	Garamendi	Manzullo
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant
Boustany	Giffords	Markley (CO)
Braley (IA)	Gingrey (GA)	Markey (MA)
Bright	Gonzalez	Marshall
Brown (GA)	Goodlatte	Matsui
Brown-Waite,	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Ginny	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (NY)
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Burgess	Grayson	McClintock
Burton (IN)	Green, Al	McCollum
Buyer	Green, Gene	McCotter
Calvert	Griffith	McDermott
Camp	Guthrie	McGovern
Cantor	Hall (NY)	McHenry
Capito	Hall (TX)	McIntyre
Capps	Halvorson	McKeon
Cardoza	Hare	McMahon
Carnahan	Harman	McMorris
Carney	Harper	Rodgers
Carson (IN)	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Castle	Heinrich	Meeks (NY)
Castor (FL)	Heller	Mica
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Michaud
Chandler	Herger	Miller (MI)
Childers	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)
Chu	Higgins	Miller, Gary
Clarke	Himes	Miller, George
Clay	Hinchee	Minnick
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Mitchell
Clyburn	Hirono	Mollohan
Coble	Holt	Moore (KS)
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Cohen	Hunter	Murphy (CT)
Cole	Israel	Murphy (NY)
Conaway	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Connolly (VA)	Jackson Lee	Murphy, Tim
Conyers	(TX)	Nadler (NY)
Cooper	Jenkins	Neal (MA)
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer
Courtney	Johnson (IL)	Nye
Crenshaw	Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar
Critz	Johnson, Sam	Obey
Crowley	Jones	Olson
Cuellar	Jordan (OH)	Oliver
Culberson	Kagen	Ortiz
Cummings	Kanjorski	Owens
Dahlkemper	Kaptur	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pascarell
Davis (KY)	Kildee	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Paul
DeFazio	Kind	Paulsen
DeGette	King (IA)	

Payne	Ruppersberger	Stupak
Pence	Rush	Sullivan
Perlmutter	Ryan (OH)	Teague
Perriello	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Peters	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Peterson	T.	Thompson (MS)
Petri	Scalise	Thompson (PA)
Pingree (ME)	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Pitts	Schauer	Tiahrt
Platts	Schiff	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Schmidt	Tierney
Polis (CO)	Schock	Titus
Pomeroy	Schrader	Tonko
Posey	Schwartz	Tsongas
Price (GA)	Scott (GA)	Turner
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Upton
Putnam	Sensenbrenner	Van Hollen
Rahall	Serrano	Velázquez
Rangel	Sessions	Visclosky
Rehberg	Sestak	Walz
Reichert	Shadegg	Wasserman
Reyes	Shea-Porter	Schultz
Richardson	Sherman	Watson
Rodriguez	Shimkus	Watt
Roe (TN)	Shuster	Waxman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Welch
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Rooney	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Wilson (OH)
Roskam	Snyder	Wittman
Ross	Space	Wolf
Rothman (NJ)	Speier	Woolsey
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Wu
Royce	Stearns	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—75

Baird	Gohmert	Nunes
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Quigley
Berman	Grijalva	Radanovich
Bonner	Gutierrez	Rogers (KY)
Boozman	Hill	Rohrabacher
Boyd	Hodes	Salazar
Brady (PA)	Hoekstra	Sanchez, Loretta
Brady (TX)	Holden	Sarbanes
Brown (SC)	Honda	Shuler
Brown, Corrine	Inglis	Simpson
Butterfield	Inslee	Sires
Campbell	Issa	Skelton
Cao	Kilpatrick (MI)	Slaughter
Capuano	Kirk	Stark
Carter	Linder	Sutton
Costello	Lipinski	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Taylor
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Towns
Delahunt	Matheson	Walden
Diaz-Balart, L.	Melancon	Wamp
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Waters
Fattah	Moran (KS)	Weiner
Forbes	Moran (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Myrick	Yarmuth
Gerlach	Napolitano	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1926

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 357. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5502, the ECO-Gift Card Act, which amends the effective date of the gift card provisions of the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today, in order to attend important meetings in my district, I was absent from votes on H. Res. 1368, Supporting the goals of National Dairy Month; H. Res. 1409, Expressing support for designation

of June 20, 2010, as “American Eagle Day”, and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; and H.R. 5502, ECO-Gift Card Act. Should I have been present, I would have supported these resolutions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend several votes today, June 14, 2010. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage of H. Res. 1368, “aye” on final passage of H. Res. 1409 and “aye” on final passage of H.R. 5502.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 355, 356, and 357.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5486, SMALL BUSINESS JOBS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2010; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5297, SMALL BUSINESS LENDING FUND ACT OF 2010

Ms. PINGREE of Maine, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-506) on the resolution (H. Res. 1436) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5486) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

2010 TONY AWARDS: “MEMPHIS” WINS BEST MUSICAL

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening in New York City, the Tony Awards were presented, and I was very proud that the play “Memphis” was awarded the best musical. It also received three other Tonys—for best book and best score and best orchestrations.

Mr. Bryan and Mr. DiPietro put a great play on Broadway that talks about racial reconciliation and a city that has a great deal of love and a great deal of music in it that comes to the screen and won a Tony. It's a great honor; but I encourage people even more so to come to Memphis to see the original cast, where a city that is alive and breathing with entertainment and great venues for fun and racial reconciliation exists. The music, the life,

the spirit, the original production. Memphis, Tennessee.

Jump on an airplane.

Don't get a fast train.

Get your ticket for an airplane.

Come on home.

LEAGUE AGAINST CANCER

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize La Liga Contra el Cancer, the League Against Cancer, a South Florida nonprofit group committed to providing free medical care and assistance to cancer patients who would otherwise not have the necessary financial resources to fight such a difficult battle.

Since 1975, La Liga has served more than 50,000 low-income individuals. The positive impact that this organization has had on our community is without question, and we should all be grateful for its efforts.

Just this month, the League hosted its premier event to raise cancer awareness and funding for care. Residents of our area certainly answered the call, pledging much needed help for cancer victims through La Liga. In fact, they pledged over \$4.5 million to the League.

South Floridians in general, and each and every member of the League in specific, are committed to fighting cancer in all forms.

Again, I congratulate the League Against Cancer for its successful event that results in saving lives in our community.

□ 1930

DISAPPOINTMENTS PILE UP

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to find out what is in the health care bill, the disappointments pile up.

The publication "Politico" reported on June 8, "Part of the health care overall due to kick in this September could strip more than 1 million people of their insurance coverage, violating a key goal of President Barack Obama's reforms."

These limited benefit plans provide insurance to part-time workers and retail and restaurant employees. The plans are called mini-med plans. They are priced low to impose a maximum on insurance payouts in a year and to restrict the number of covered doctor visits, according to the article. The current health care reform would prohibit these plans because there is a ban in the law on annual caps.

Employer and trade associations, like 7-Eleven, the National Restaurant Association, and the U.S. Chamber of

Commerce, have asked that these low-cost plans be allowed to continue despite the law. In their letter, these groups explain that if the ban is strictly implemented, this population would likely be left with no coverage until 2014. We are talking about 1.4 million people who will not be allowed to keep their present insurance.

So much for promises.

PAY DOWN NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, instead of attempting to pay down the national debt, this Congress continues to spend taxpayer dollars into oblivion. Outside the Beltway, whether you are paying credit card bills or just paying your taxes, you are held accountable for your spending habits and for paying back the money you owe.

What I discovered during my first year in Congress is that those in power have no regard for the billions that they spend each day and are not interested in developing ways to pay back this borrowed money. Day after way day, the American people call for us to stop the out-of-control spending. This Congress ignored those pleas and charges full speed ahead, mounting a \$13 trillion national debt.

Americans rightly expect their government to pass a budget plan to get this spending under control. But, instead, Congress has neglected to pass a budget resolution, and the future looks grim. I am incredibly frustrated with this Congress, and I know my constituents feel the same way.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC., June 14, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, H-232 U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Tuesday, June 14, 2010 at 2:55 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress that he has extended the national emergency with respect to North Korea beyond June 26, 2010, by notice filed earlier with the Federal Register.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-121)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2010.

The existence and the risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula constitute a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and maintain certain restrictions with respect, to North Korea and North Korean nationals.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 2010.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RICKY DOBBS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House and the good people of America, I rise on a very special occasion, to pay tribute and to recognize the outstanding and excellent work of one of my constituents in Douglasville, Georgia, in Douglas County. This is an extraordinary story. This young individual, Mr. Ricky Dobbs, who is a native of Douglasville, Georgia, and a graduate of Douglas County High School has gone on to excellence and greatness in an extraordinary career of academic achievement as well as athletic achievement.

During his years as a Douglas County High School student, he portrayed such a commendable attribute that his teachers affectionately referred to him as "the Mayor." He was the recipient of the Faculty Cup at his commencement ceremony in 2006. Ricky Dobbs, who has demonstrated outstanding achievement in academics, was accepted into the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis. And in sports, he is

leading Navy football as its quarterback. And what a quarterback he has become.

In the 2008 Navy football season, Ricky Dobbs rushed for 498 yards and eight touchdowns, and Navy was honored at the White House in April 2009 for winning a sixth straight Commander in Chief's Trophy by President Barack Obama. In his role as quarterback for the Navy Midshipmen in 2009, Ricky Dobbs broke the single season college record for the most rushing touchdowns by a quarterback. Yes, indeed, Ricky Dobbs finished with the NCAA record of 27 single-season rushing touchdowns and was named the game's most valuable player in the 2009 Texas Bowl.

Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, Ricky has thrown just four interceptions in his entire career as quarterback for the Navy, or 0.033 percent, the lowest interception percentage in Naval football history. Ricky Dobbs has scored four or more rushing touchdowns on four different occasions. In other words, four touchdowns in four different games, including three times in three games this past year. No other Navy player has more than one career four rushing touchdown day, and that includes the legendary Roger Staubach.

Ricky Dobbs comes from a humble beginning. He has a family, a loving family, and when you give credit and you recognize the achievements of a young man or a young lady, you certainly have to recognize the achievements of those parents. Barbara Cobb and Clarence Dobbs have done a remarkable job of rearing this young man. But we can't stop there, for when you recognize the achievement of Ricky Dobbs of Douglasville and Douglas County, you have got to recognize that entire community that has put its arms around and reared and nurtured this outstanding young man to soar in academics as well as perform excellently in record-shattering circumstances on the football field for the prestigious Navy Academy.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this, one word comes to mind, and that word is "excellence." When that word was put to the great Greek philosopher Aristotle, when Aristotle was asked, What does it take to be an excellent person, Aristotle said, In order to be an excellent person, you must first of all know thyself. Well, Ricky Dobbs knows who he is, and that is, he is a child of God.

The question was later put to the great emperor and general, Marcus Aurelius of Rome: Marcus Aurelius, what does it take to be an excellent person? Marcus Aurelius replied, In order to be an excellent person, you must first of all discipline yourself.

What discipline it took to achieve academically at Douglas County High School and then to move up to the prestigious Navy Academy and set these astounding, record-shattering records on the football field.

And then, finally, the question was put to the Messiah, Jesus Christ, when he was asked, What does it take to be a great person, an excellent person? Jesus said, Sacrifice yourself.

As a military person, he is doing that for his country. Let's give this tribute to this outstanding young man and make this day, ladies and gentlemen, Ricky Dobbs Day in this United States of America.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO INCLUDE EXTRANEEOUS MATERIAL

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to introduce an article into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

STAYING HOOKED ON A DIRTY FUEL: WHY CANADIAN TAR SANDS PIPELINES ARE A BAD BET FOR THE UNITED STATES

(From the National Wildlife Federation Report)

CONFRONTING GLOBAL WARMING—INTRODUCTION

"America is addicted to oil."

When President George W. Bush uttered these words in his 2006 State of the Union address, the former Texas oilman acknowledged an imperative as important as any we can imagine for the nation's future: breaking that crude addiction.

Our addiction to oil has come with an untenable cost: to our national security, to our air and water, and to the ability of our warming planet to support billions of human lives. The recent Gulf Coast crisis, stemming from an exploding offshore drilling rig, is just one more reason to kick our prodigious habit. The United States consumes about one quarter of the world's oil—around 20 million barrels a day, and imports nearly two-thirds of that—about 13 million barrels per day. For economic, political, military and ecological reasons, the United States needs to address this addiction—and beat it.

The burgeoning Canadian tar sands industry epitomizes the depths of our addiction. Tar sands are a combination of clay, sand, and bitumen found in great quantities under the boreal forest of Alberta. By employing massive mining operations or energy-intensive underground heating and production techniques, energy companies produce a sludge-like heavy oil that can be further refined into transportation fuels like gasoline or diesel. As this report explains, expanding the mining, processing and refining of these tar sands represents a tragic choice for Canada, the United States, and the world.

British Petroleum's Deepwater Horizon tragedy off the Louisiana coast, which killed 11 men and is an unfolding ecological disaster, is not an argument to expand Canadian tar sands development, as some have argued. The Gulf Coast catastrophe should instead propel us away from a future of diminishing returns and higher costs from "unconventional" fossil fuel extraction, which includes tar sands, oil shale and coal-to-liquids. Moving deeper into tar sands would be taking the country down the wrong path—one that leads to an inevitable dead-end.

The tar sands industry aims to create an extensive web of pipelines to deliver increasing amounts of this Canadian tar sands sludge to refineries in the United States. The U.S. federal government has already approved two dedicated tar sands pipelines and is poised to approve a third. The Canadian

company Enbridge's Alberta Clipper pipeline, running from the U.S.-Canadian border in North Dakota, and across Minnesota to Wisconsin, has already been completed. TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which the State Department approved in 2009, runs from Alberta to Illinois and on to Oklahoma. TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL pipeline is the third pipeline whose permit application is currently being reviewed by the U.S. State Department. It would cut through America's heartland, running nearly 2,000 miles from Alberta down to Port Arthur, Texas, where the tar sands will be refined into transportation fuels. Other, shorter pipelines are envisioned to run to refineries around the country. This network of tar sands pipelines would deliver even more pollution to refineries where and the surrounding communities, which are already experiencing health effects.

The proposed Keystone XL pipeline will traverse rivers and carve across prairies, will flow on top of vital aquifers, and threaten farmers, ranchers and wildlife when it leaks or breaks, as it unquestionably will. Building this new pipeline would institutionalize a demand for a product that we do not need—especially if we seize the initiative to wean ourselves from this a fuel that is sullyng our coasts, tearing up our heartland, and destroying the health and livelihoods of communities. Current projections are that the new pipeline would not even run close to capacity, raising the question of why the U.S. is even considering this project.

Promoting the growth of the Canadian tar sands industry is a dangerous and foolhardy development. This pipeline system would virtually assure the destruction of swaths of one of the world's most important forest ecosystems, produce lake-sized reservoirs of toxic waste, import a thick, tarlike fuel that will release vast quantities of toxic chemicals into our air when it is refined in the U.S., and emit significantly more global warming pollutants into the atmosphere than fuels made from conventional oil. Communities that live near the tar sands are already experiencing health problems linked to the pollution, and dozens of wildlife species are at risk, including millions of migrating cranes, swans, and songbirds. If Keystone XL crosses our border, it will cut through thousands of miles of sensitive habitat in America's heartland. When the tar sands are refined in U.S. facilities, the resulting pollution will foul our air and water.

We believe that the U.S. needs clean and renewable energy solutions as we make the inevitable and necessary transition to a post-oil world. Tar sands, as well as other inferior fossil fuels like oil shale, simply should not be part of the equation. Tar sands are a starkly inefficient, polluting, ecologically disastrous and expensive way to power our cars and trucks. Each tar sands pipeline our government approves further increases our dependence on this dirty fuel. These pipelines will become, in effect, a long-term, government-approved pollution delivery system.

If we allow all these pipelines to be built, we are essentially saying that we are willing to feed our oil habit, even if we know it will harm our air, water, health, prosperity and planet. Agreeing to increase our imports of Canadian tar sands represents the worst kind of addictive behavior: "persistent compulsive use of a substance known by the user to be physically, psychologically, or socially harmful."

Why then, we ask in this report, is the U.S. poised to allow this expanded pipeline network that will lock our country into an ongoing reliance on the dirtiest of fossil fuels?

It is time to apply every ounce of American ingenuity to finding a technological

path to a future that relies far less on oil and other fossil fuels and far more on sources of fuel that are renewable, sustainable, and clean. By applying the talent and technology of America's best minds and businesses, this country can dramatically improve our environment and accelerate our move beyond a dirty energy economy.

We have arrived at a critical crossroads that will determine whether we can break free from this dependence—or lash ourselves tighter to it. Building new pipelines to import billions of barrels of dirty fuel from Canada is taking the wrong path into increasingly hazardous terrain. We should tell our elected leaders to reconsider.

BIG OIL PUSHES FOR PIPELINES: TRANSPORTING A DIRTY FUEL THAT RAVAGES ALBERTA'S FORESTS AND WATERS

TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT

An aerial view of the area around Fort McMurray, Alberta, provides a stark portrait of an addiction. The Athabasca River, snaking through a region once marked by unending vistas of glowing green conifers and populated by woodland caribou, moose, bears and lynx, now demarcates ground zero for what is arguably the most destructive peacetime industrial activity in the history of mankind.

Tar sands development has transformed a landscape of boreal forest and peat lands into a vast oil sacrifice zone. On either side of the river, a series of giant open pit mines, belching processing facilities, and poisonous tailings ponds now line the floodplains and wetlands. The giant toxic tailings ponds have grown large enough to see from space.

Even more troubling, the industrial activity is poised to spread across the landscape like blight. If all the current Canadian tar sands leases are exploited, development is slated to encompass an area the size of New York and New Jersey combined.

The Canadian tar sands industry is, by almost any measure, one of the most wasteful and polluting industries humanity has ever invented. Over the past ten years, commercial tar sands production became increasingly profitable because of rising oil prices and massive infrastructure construction that accelerated the development's expanding reach. In pursuit of profits that increased with the scaled-up production, energy companies have torn up a province, released countless gallons of toxic sludge into waterways, emitted hundreds of millions of tons of global warming pollutants into the atmosphere, and produced billions of barrels of viscous, heavy oil that requires vast amounts of energy to transport and refine into a transportation fuel.

EXTRACTING BITUMEN

Locked in underground pockets of sand, clay and water, tar sands contain bitumen, which is a heavy, black viscous oil that can be extracted, upgraded, refined, and turned into fuel. The Canadian Energy Research Institute estimates that these tar sands contain 1.7 trillion barrels of heavy crude, of which approximately 173 billion barrels are recoverable.

About 20 percent of Alberta's tar sands deposit is close enough to the surface to be dug up using conventional open pit mining techniques. Using this method, the forest is clear-cut and giant open pit mines carve the layers of tar sands from the earth. These tar sands are trucked to facilities where they are heated into a liquid, and the bitumen is separated from the sand and clay. This process requires substantial amounts of water and energy, and leaves behind a number of toxic byproducts.

Another technique, known as in situ production, will be used to target the other 80

percent of tar sands deposits, located deeper in the ground. In situ production requires companies to insert pipes into the ground, which are filled with steam to heat up the tar sands and liquify the bitumen. This liquid bitumen is then pumped to the surface much like conventional oil. Although this technique does not result in the same wholesale habitat destruction as strip mines, industry claims that in situ mining is a "solution" for tar sands environmental problems is overstated. This process requires substantially more energy than conventional mining, leaving a much larger carbon footprint. In situ mining also fragments the landscape with roads and pumping stations, requires large amounts of water, and still leaves toxic tailings ponds during the upgrading process.

Both open pit mining and in situ processes require systems of roads, pads, industrial facilities and tailings ponds that all contribute to the fragmentation and destruction of the boreal forest. The tailings ponds—which are more like giant toxic lakes filled with pollutants like benzene, cyanide, and mercury—stretch across the landscape, threatening human health and wildlife.

THREATENING DOWNRIVER COMMUNITIES

Scientists already have catalogued human health problems among the First Nations people who live downriver. Studies have raised alarms about increased cancer rates and autoimmune diseases. In the Fort Chipewyan First Nation, where subsistence hunting and fishing is still prevalent, hunters say they have noticed big changes in the game they harvest—including the fact that moose livers are enlarged and white-spotted. Water from the Athabasca River, their main water source, now leaves brown residue in the pot when they boil it. Fish they depend on are contaminated with high levels of mercury and toxic cancer-causing chemicals.

Because the communities in the vicinity of the mining sites are small, there has been relatively little monitoring of how much the industrial activity has affected human and wildlife health. What is clear is that the process of extracting, upgrading, and refining tar sands requires a suite of chemicals and produces toxic byproducts.

DELIVERY TO THE U.S.

Much the tar sands upgrading to date has taken place in Alberta, but the refining capacity is not high enough for the projected increase in production. That is why the tar sands industry is proposing pipelines to the U.S.: to bring the unrefined heavy crude to refineries in the U.S.

Today, approximately 60 percent of Canadian tar sands fuel is exported to the U.S. Our nation currently imports about 800,000 barrels of this fuel a day, and some project that this could increase fivefold if all the planned pipelines are constructed, world oil supply from conventional oil dwindles, and global demand intensifies.

In Canada, concern and opposition has been rising as the ecological fallout from tar sands production becomes more visible. If the U.S. continues its voracious oil habit and builds these pipelines to support it, we will be contributing to this Canadian calamity for many years to come.

POISONED HABITAT: WILDLIFE IN THE CROSSHAIRS

A DESTRUCTIVE BUSINESS

The video footage is heartbreaking: a mallard drake, flapping its wings in muck and beak dripping black gunk, barely keeping afloat in oil sludge. No, not Alaska after the infamous Exxon Valdez spill, or the Gulf Coast wetlands after the BP explosion. It is the result of "normal" tar sands development in Alberta.

Scientists are only beginning to understand the extent of the impacts of Alberta

tar sands production on the fish, waterfowl, and forest animals that live in the remote boreal forest that has become the hub of industrial tar sands production. Habitat destruction and fragmentation is expanding rapidly, and even energy companies acknowledge that they are effectively destroying habitat as they go. In a recent report by Cambridge Energy Research Associates, the authors quote the energy giant Shell describing the impacts in an application for a mine expansion: "Effectively, a complete loss of soil and terrain, terrestrial vegetation, wetlands and forest resources, wildlife and biodiversity happens for this area for the period of operations."

This kind of large-scale habitat destruction raises even larger concerns, because there is so much at stake in this fecund northern wilderness.

The surrounding forest is home to the full complement of wildlife any sportsman would imagine living in the Canadian wilderness: bears, wolves, lynx, and important herds of woodland caribou. The Athabasca River is part of a vital nesting and staging ground for migratory waterfowl, many of which winter in the continental U.S. The Canadian boreal forest provides breeding, nesting or migration stops for more than 300 species of birds—including several species of cranes, shorebirds, and more than a million inland birds.

FULL IMPACTS UNKNOWN

Scientists know very little about the cumulative impacts of tar sands development, says Canadian ecologist Kevin Timoney, because the Canadian government, provincial authorities, and energy companies have not conducted adequate monitoring and testing. Timoney however, has begun documenting a series of harmful effects to wildlife from habitat fragmentation, toxic exposures, and other threats to wildlife.

Some of these effects have gained public notice. In 2008, 1,600 ducks perished when they landed in a tar sands mine tailings pond operated by Syncrude. Originally, the company downplayed the numbers, and it took several years and a prosecution to bring the extent of the damage to light. A lawsuit is pending against Syncrude.

Timoney estimates that even 1,600 substantially underestimates bird mortality from this event—and many others that remain undocumented. In an article published in the *Open Conservation Biology Journal*, Timoney laid out a disturbing case that tar sands development has led to a permanent loss of at least 58,000 birds—and possibly as many as 400,000.

The Syncrude tailings pond deaths were the result of the birds becoming mired in oil, despite companies' efforts to shoo birds away from their toxic tailings ponds using noise cannons and scarecrows. The Cambridge Energy Research Report states that, "the surface layer of bitumen found on most tailings ponds is an acute threat to wildlife."

Timoney says there are other dangers as well. He and others have documented at least 43 other bird species—waterfowl and shore birds, birds of prey and gulls—that have died from tar sands-related development. Timoney also made a Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy request of the Alberta Sustainable Resources Development, which disclosed that 27 black bears, 67 deer, 31 red foxes, 21 coyotes and unspecified numbers of moose, muskrats, beavers, voles, martens, wolves and bats had also perished on tar sands operations between 2000 and 2008.

Even more disturbing, Timoney discovered that those reported numbers came from the energy companies themselves, suggesting an under-reporting of some significance. "The

numbers of dead animals reported to government," he wrote, "underestimated true mortality because they were derived from ad hoc reporting by companies rather than from a scientifically valid and statistically robust sampling design."

In another study, Timoney analyzed data from government and industry sources that revealed strong evidence of chemical contamination in the Athabasca River. Specifically, the levels of known cancer-causing chemicals were as high as in industrial zones in the United States. Elevated levels of mercury and other heavy metals were also present. A government report from the Regional Aquatics Monitoring Program determined that more than seven percent of river fish showed growth abnormalities, which Timoney says is "high."

AN EXPANDING THREAT

There is every reason to believe this problem will only worsen. According to Environmental Defense Canada, tar sands tailings ponds already have a surface area of 50 square miles, twice the size of Manhattan. These contaminated tailings ponds have already leaked into the nearby waterways, and projections are they will triple in size.

This spells more trouble for wildlife, especially migrating birds. According to Colleen Cassidy St. Clair and Robert Ronconi from the University of Alberta's Faculty of Science, "spring migration is a particular problem in northeastern Alberta, when the warm-water waste from oil sands mines are the only open water—the natural bodies are still frozen. When waterfowl land in these ponds, they may ingest oil and their plumage may become oiled with waste bitumen, potentially preventing birds from flying or leading to lost insulation and death from hypothermia."

Even though there has been very little study of the effects of tar sands development on wildlife, the indications are that this development is releasing a potentially devastating onslaught on Canadian and internationally-migrating animals. As ecologist Timoney put it: "The effects of these pollutants on ecosystem and public health deserve immediate and systematic study. Projected tripling of tar sands activities over the next decade may result in unacceptably large and unforeseen impacts on biodiversity, ecosystem function, and public health. The attention of the world's scientific community is urgently needed."

ADMINISTRATION MISSING IN ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is missing in action on American border security. Our ineffective border security plan seems to be one of compassionate disinterest or catch them if you can.

Last week there was not another violent incident at the border near El Paso, Texas. This time a lone Border Patrol agent spotted a group of Mexican nationals crossing the border illegally. The agent was able to apprehend one of the illegals, but four illegals began assaulting the sole law enforcement officer with rocks. His life was in danger, and he defended himself. One of the assailants was killed, however; an assailant with a long criminal history of smuggling.

Our law enforcement agents have the moral and legal right to defend themselves, and they have the right to defend the American border.

□ 1945

The Mexican military showed up at the scene, however. They pointed their rifles at the American law enforcement agents. So what did they do? Did they stand their ground? Did they protect the sovereignty of the United States of America? No. Our Border Patrol agents retreated. They fled. And why? Because the Federal Government doesn't back up the Border Patrol.

The government hangs them out to dry. Just ask Border Patrol agents Ramos and Compean. Washington only gives lip service to securing the border. The government tells our Border Patrol to go down there on the border and kind of pretend to enforce the law. They don't receive the support they need to secure the border. They don't get the necessary manpower or the necessary equipment. They don't receive the necessary moral support from the government. The government doesn't back up their right to protect themselves when their lives are in danger. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, is missing in action.

But right on cue, Mexican President Calderon arrogantly demanded an apology for the shooting. But Calderon didn't apologize for the shooting of Robert Krentz, the Arizona rancher who was murdered in America on his own property by a Mexican criminal alien.

Calderon didn't apologize for the execution-style murder of Border Patrol agent Robert Rosas in Campo, California. Calderon didn't apologize when Senior Patrol Agent Luis Aguilar was murdered in America, run down and run over by a Mexican narcoterrorist drug smuggler in a Humvee.

Where's Calderon's outrage over the Americans being killed all the time in America by illegals from Mexico? Where's Calderon's apology for the criminal alien murderer of Houston Police Officer Rodney Johnson? Officer Johnson was a 12-year veteran of the Houston police force. He was married, had five kids, and Officer Johnson was shot four times execution-style by a Mexican illegal with a criminal record when he was stopped for speeding.

Where was Calderon when Houston Police Officer Gary Gryder was killed by an illegal in 2008? Or when Houston Police Officer Henry Canales was murdered by an illegal just last year? Americans are frequently killed in America by Mexican illegals. And why doesn't our government demand an apology about these homicides? Why doesn't our government demand compensation from Mexico for the homicides their illegals commit in the United States?

And where's the State Department? Where's the outrage, the concern when it's an American that loses their life, cost their lives by the actions of

illegals from Mexico? Where's that demand for an apology? And where's the administration? Missing in action, that's where.

Where's your outrage, Mr. President? The President should be on the American side of the border, doing what's best for America. And why don't we protect our own? How hard would it be for the President of the United States just to say, Don't cross the American border without permission? Why doesn't he say that? Doesn't he believe those words?

Mexican criminals think they can come over here and do as they please and nobody's going to really do anything about it. And they're right. Did we send our Attorney General out to demand answers when Border Patrol agent Rosas was shot execution-style last year? Where was the Attorney General? Missing in action.

And American citizens and peace officers are losing their lives because the government is missing in action. Seems like our government is more interested in what Mr. Calderon thinks than the American people. Mr. Calderon should take care of his own lawless country and Mr. Obama should take care of our borders. The administration, this administration, is not the first to be ineffective in border security, but it certainly should be the last.

And that's just the way it is.

THE LONGEST WAR IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the war in Afghanistan is now 104 months old, passing Vietnam, to make it the longest war in United States history. And as it reaches this dubious milestone, it's hard to imagine things going much worse. The much-hyped military campaign in Kandahar is now way behind schedule, with the Secretary of Defense saying it's more important to get it done right than to get it done quickly.

That kind of plea might have worked 80 months ago, Mr. Speaker, but do they not see the irony or the disconnect in preaching patience about a war that is now the longest the Nation has ever fought? Do they not see that the American people, who have given a thousand or more of their best young people and a quarter of a trillion dollars to this war, are long past the point where they are willing to cut some slack and take a wait-and-see approach?

And if that's not bad enough, it turns out the campaign we thought we had just finished in Marja never really took in the first place. What seemed to be a quick and decisive military triumph turned out to be an illusion. The Taliban hadn't been crushed; they had gone into hiding, laying low for a while, taking part in the opium harvest, and regaining their bearings, so

to speak. Now the Taliban is back, with a campaign of violence and intimidation, planting bombs, attacking marines, and terrorizing the population. As one report in The Washington Post put it, "They still own the night."

General McChrystal promised to have a ready-made so-called "government in a box" prepared to take over in Marja, but inside that box was a district governor considered hapless by most, who has been outfitted by the marines with a fancily furnished tent, who seems more fond of afternoon naps than in doing the hard work of governing.

And the national government that is supposed to be our partner, the repository of our hopes and confidence, the leader of the regime that is supposed to pick up where U.S. troops leave off in providing stability and security, well, his heart doesn't seem to be in the mission. Just a few weeks after being wine and dined by his American hosts during a state visit, President Karzai is wondering aloud whether the United States and NATO can get the job done.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that with each setback and each delay pressure will build to extend the timetable for troop deployment, our troops getting out of Afghanistan. This would be the wrong lesson to learn. What's needed is not more time, but a different policy. Every day that we continue this military campaign will contribute to the chaos in Afghanistan. More time and more troops can only exacerbate the problem. They cannot solve it.

I don't think I can describe the war any better than did New York Times columnist Bob Herbert. He said: "It's just a mind-numbing, soul-chilling, body-destroying slog, month after month, and year after pointless year."

Mr. Speaker, it's time to end the slog. It's time to end the longest war in American history. It's past time to bring our troops home.

DISMAY WITH DOD GENERAL COUNSEL REGARDING RENAMING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to express my sincere dismay with the letter from Jeh Johnson, general counsel of the Department of Defense, to Senator CARL LEVIN, declaring the DOD opposition to Senate bill 504, legislation to rename the Department of the Navy as the Department of Navy and Marine Corps. In his letter Mr. Johnson states: "The renaming of the Department is unnecessary and would incur additional expense of several hundred thousand dollars a year over the next several years."

In response to my letter, the CBO report actually states that "the bill would have very little effect on most U.S. Naval or Marine Corps installations. The cost of implementing this

bill would be less than \$500,000 a year over the next several years from appropriated funds. And enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues." So therefore it would not have an impact, Mr. Speaker.

With that said, I would like to ask Mr. Johnson, Do you think that our men and women of the United States Marine Corps are worth this small monetary amount? Have they not earned the right to be recognized and respected?

Mr. Speaker, it is a joke for DOD to be concerned about such a small monetary amount considering the money that has been and is continuing to be wasted by the Department of Defense. An audit conducted by the Department of Defense IG revealed that the Federal Government failed to substantiate the disbursements of at least \$7.8 billion of \$8.2 billion spent for goods and services in Iraq. I would think Mr. Johnson should be more focused on serious money issues such as these instead of focusing his efforts on opposing the recognition that our marines truly deserve.

Our marines have fought alongside the Navy for many years, and if they are truly viewed as one fighting team, they should receive equal recognition. This bill is not meant to take anything away from the Navy. It does not demand any special concessions for the Marine Corps. It simply adds three words to the name. I am baffled as to why Mr. Johnson felt the need to interject into this matter now, when it has been ongoing for the past 10 years. We have the support of a record 425 Members of the House of Representatives and 80 Members of the Senate. The numbers alone should speak volumes.

And, Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want people to see this young marine who gave his life for this country. The family received posthumously the Silver Star medal that he earned by giving his life for this country. This is an official copy. And it says the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C., with the Navy flag. That's all it has at the heading, Mr. Speaker. Nothing about the Marine Corps in the heading, but Navy.

If this bill should become law, what it would say is what you see now, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, Navy flag, Marine flag, present the Silver Star posthumously to this man's family.

Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to close as I always do, because our men and women, as Ms. WOOLSEY said, they are over there fighting, giving their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan, and I would ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, please bless their families, and, God, please bless the House and Senate that we will do right in the eyes of God.

And, dear God, I ask three times, please God, continue to bless this country. And, God, please always remember that we care that you look after us so that we will do what's right for your people. God, continue to bless America.

RESPONSE TO LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have a huge problem in our country that we haven't come to terms with, long-term unemployment. The number of Americans who have been jobless for over 6 months has hit the highest level ever recorded. I recently read an article that highlighted one of the long-term unemployed Americans. Her name is Cindy Paoletti. For 23 years she worked in the corporate accounting division of J.P. Morgan Chase in upstate New York. In December 2007, Ms. Paoletti was let go in a wave of layoffs that eventually shuttered the entire Syracuse operations center. Her job went to India.

She started collecting unemployment benefits and severance while searching for a job. In her own words, Cindy says, "I apply for everything out there." Now that she's about to run out of benefits, she has started taking money out of her IRA. She doesn't have health insurance, and she faces the daily fear of losing her home. I hear similar stories from all over the country. Jobless Americans are desperately looking for work, but there just aren't enough jobs to go around yet.

Last week, I conducted a hearing in my subcommittee to discuss long-term unemployment problems. Here are a few of the facts highlighted at the hearing: nearly 50 percent of the unemployed haven't been able to find a job for more than 6 months, the highest number ever recorded, which goes back to 1948. More than 10 million jobs must be created to restore the labor market to its pre-recession level.

This huge jobs hole, created by 8 years of gross economic mismanagement under the Bush administration, has left five unemployed workers competing for every available job. In responding to these record rates of long-term unemployment, our first priority must be to maintain the current emergency Federal unemployment programs that have lapsed 2 weeks ago. People have been waiting for 2 weeks.

The House passed an extension on these programs a long time ago, but the Senate has yet to clear the legislation. If the Senate fails to continue Federal unemployment program, 5 million long-term unemployed Americans will lose their extended benefits before the end of this year, with 1.2 million of them losing their benefits by the end of this month, June. We need to face the fact that even with an extension of these Federal unemployment programs, more than 3 million people are projected to exhaust all benefits available before the end of the year.

□ 2000

We need to provide more help for these long-term displaced workers, which could range from additional extended unemployment benefits in high unemployment States, to federally funded jobs programs, to better training employment services.

A few months of employment gains, as welcome as they have been recently, have not suddenly eliminated the problem of long-term unemployment. We simply cannot abandon millions of Americans who have worked hard, played by the rules, and now find themselves with no jobs, no savings, and no support. We cannot let a huge section of the middle class go with nothing but food stamps.

At the end of the article, I mentioned earlier Cindy Paoletti said, "Out of all the people I know that got laid off the same time as me, I think only three have found jobs. The rest . . . have exhausted unemployment or they're getting close to the end of it. Someone's got to do something."

The Congress is faced with this. The Senate is dawdling. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that they act and we then move on to the next level while we deal with long-term unemployment in this country. We cannot close our eyes and believe it's going to go away. It will not go away. We have to help the process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING THE CALHOUN YELLOW JACKETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Calhoun Yellow Jackets for defeating Cook County High by a score of 8-2 in the deciding game to win the 2010 AA Georgia State baseball tournament. The Yellow Jackets clinched the series in game three with excellent pitching and three home runs.

I would especially like to recognize Manager Chip Henderson and the Calhoun coaching staff for leading the Yellow Jackets to a remarkable 35-1 record this season. Calhoun, Georgia, truly had a remarkable season, Mr. Speaker, dominating their opponents by scoring, believe this, 376 runs in just 33 games this season. That's an average of over 10 runs per game, Mr. Speaker.

I am extremely proud to represent Gordon County and Calhoun, Georgia, in the 11th Congressional District, and I couldn't be prouder of the Calhoun Yellow Jackets for capturing their fourth State championship title.

Congratulations, Calhoun. Best of luck to all of the seniors who are graduating this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks into the RECORD on this topic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to anchor this Special Order hour on health care for the Congressional Black Caucus. Currently, the Congressional Black Caucus is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California.

I would now yield to our chair, the Honorable BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. First, let me thank my friend and colleague, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE of Ohio, for anchoring tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on the immediate benefits of health care reform. Also, let me just thank and salute Congresswoman FUDGE for her consistency and her commitment to hold these Special Orders so that we can bring attention to some of the most pressing issues confronting our country that often don't really make the headlines. So I would especially like to thank Congresswoman FUDGE for leading tonight's Special Order once again on the immediate benefits of health care reform and for continuing to keep our caucus focused on addressing the key issues facing our Nation. She has many, many of the same problems and issues in Ohio as I do in California, as all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus have, whether we come from rural districts or urban districts. I just

want to thank you very much for your leadership and for once again sounding the alarm.

As chair of the 42-member Congressional Black Caucus, I rise tonight to talk about the health care crisis in America and to inform the American people about our actions and agenda working with President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, Leader REID, and what we're doing to make us a healthier and stronger Nation.

Since Teddy Roosevelt almost a century ago, President after President has sought to deliver health care for the American people, but to no avail. This year, under the leadership of President Obama and Speaker PELOSI, the United States Congress took a major step toward delivering on the promise of health care for all Americans in a comprehensive and fiscally prudent way.

This is a very important investment in the health and wellness of all Americans. For too long, quality and affordable health care, which I believe is a fundamental human right, was way out of reach for far too many Americans and was really the province of the wealthy or those who were fortunate enough to have a job that provided health care benefits.

It was a very long and arduous struggle, but I am pleased that we continued to push to reform our health care system. It took clarity of purpose. It took moral authority. It took determination and commitment of President Obama, the brilliant and focused leadership of Speaker NANCY PELOSI and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, and the will of the majority of my colleagues in the House and the Senate, but most importantly, the will of the American people to make this a reality. Together, we fought against the insurance industry to say that we will no longer, no longer mind you, be held hostage to the denial of benefits for those who continue to pay their premiums. We won't be held hostage any longer to escalating health care costs.

Just as Social Security was in the 1930s and with the passage of Medicare and, of course, the civil rights and the voting rights acts of the 1960s, the passage of health care reform is a defining moment of our era, and I am so pleased that this happened on our watch.

As I cast my vote, I was thinking of all the people that I see in the emergency rooms and in the hospitals when I'm there with my 86-year-old mother or with my sister who has multiple sclerosis. They have health care, but I worry so much about the people that I see who don't have health care and who are just struggling to survive and who land in the emergency room because they don't have primary care.

As I cast my vote, I was thinking of all of those who died, mind you, because they didn't have preventive care and they couldn't see a doctor and they died an early death.

I was also thinking about my children and my grandchildren and future generations of Americans who will now live longer and will now live healthier lives because of the legislation we passed. I am so glad that this happened on our watch.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus worked tirelessly to ensure that this bill holds insurance companies accountable and included a number of cost-saving provisions. We were vocal advocates for provisions in the bill to combat health disparities, illnesses and diseases that disproportionately affect low-income and communities of color.

This bill is a win for all Americans because it makes us a stronger and healthier Nation. It contains many immediate benefits that Americans will begin to realize before the end of this year. In fact, just last week, thousands of senior citizens trapped into the doughnut hole prescription drug coverage, they began receiving a one-time, tax-free check for \$250. These checks will continue to be mailed over the next several months as seniors enter the coverage gap, with an estimated 4 million seniors receiving this relief. Beginning next year, seniors will get a 50 percent discount on prescription drugs if they are in this doughnut hole.

Additionally, if you are between the ages of 55 and 64 and thinking of taking an early retirement over the next few years—and many in, I know, my age group are thinking about this—but if you're in that age group and if your employer provides extended coverage, we create a temporary insurance program to help protect your coverage and to reduce premiums for you and your employer.

If you currently have private insurance, either purchased individually or through your employer, by September of this year all new plans will be prevented from denying coverage to children with preexisting conditions, dropping your health care coverage if you get sick—I mean, this is mind-boggling to think that you pay your premiums for health care and then the insurance companies can drop it if you get sick. My God, just for that reason alone everyone should have voted for this bill. It will take the lifetime cap on the amount of coverage you can receive away. Also, in addition, new plans will also be required to cover preventive services so that you don't have to pay a copay, and the cost of the service will be exempt from consideration as part of your deductible. This is a big deal.

It will set up an accountable and effective internal and external appeals process to allow you to challenge arbitrary decisions made by your health insurance company. I know my family, myself, my constituents, they get jerked around many, many times by insurance companies. They get put through so many changes. They have to jump through so many hoops just to find that their claims have been denied. Well, no more of that.

The plans on the individual market, we also tightly regulate the use of annual coverage limits and then move to full prohibition of such limits by 2014. 2014 seems like a long time, but it's really not, and so the steps that we're taking between now and 2014 I think are going to immediately help those who need this type of help.

Within one year of enactment, by next March, insurance companies will also have to ensure that they are spending at least 80 percent of the premiums that they collect from the individual market and 85 percent of premiums collected from large group market plans on actual health services. That would, for the first time, guarantee that insurance companies can't raise premiums just to provide huge salaries and bonuses to their CEOs. They actually need to ensure that they are being used to provide health care for people. Most people believe that that's what they're paying for, that's health care, not to provide these huge CEO salaries, and so finally we're going to begin to do the right thing.

If you're a small business owner, let me just say, with less than 50 employees, you will never have any obligation under this bill. You won't be required to buy health coverage for your workers, and you won't pay a penalty if you don't provide health care coverage, regardless of what you heard during the debate. This is a fact. But if you do provide health care and if you are a small business, you will get a tax credit this year up to 35 percent of the cost of your share of the insurance premium. If you continue to provide health care to your employees, then by 2014 you will receive a tax credit of up to 50 percent of your premium contribution. Believe you me, as a former small business owner, I know how important this is. Requirements on businesses that are larger than 50 people do not kick in until 2014.

That's plenty of time to get ready for this. That's when we will actually provide those subsidies to people that might not have coverage and when the national- and State-based health exchanges are officially launched. That's in 2014.

Now, if you're uninsured right now as a young person and maybe you're just looking for a job or between jobs, and if you are younger than 26 years of age and if your parents have insurance, then you will be, of course, added to their insurance plan, and it's like your parents won't have to drop you from their plan until you are 26.

If you are uninsured because you have a preexisting condition—and mind you, we learned during this debate that, unfortunately, victims of domestic violence—domestic violence was a preexisting condition. Can you believe that? Just being a woman had been a preexisting condition until now. That's shocking and pretty disgusting, really.

□ 2015

So, once again, if you have a preexisting condition, nobody, mind you,

no company will be able to deny you your benefits, but you don't qualify for Medicare. If you don't qualify for Medicare or Medicaid, then you will be eligible to buy into a temporary high-risk pool at the State level, which will price coverage at the average going rate in each State. These temporary high-risk pools will continue to offer coverage through 2014, until the subsidies and the exchanges kick in. So there are immediate benefits.

By no means is this a perfect bill—or a perfect law. We're so accustomed to saying "bill." This is a law, and we were working so hard on the legislation. Some people really think that it is hard to believe that this was signed into law, but this is a law now.

No doubt it has flaws. Many of us would have preferred—me personally, I would have preferred a single-payer system. I think my constituents would have preferred a single-payer system or at least a strong public option which we're going to continue to pay for because we have to have some kind of a competitive program so that insurance companies can begin to bring their costs down.

However, this bill offers virtually every important advance for health care that we could make at this point, making coverage more affordable and expanding access to much-needed services. This was a good bill. It is now a good law that will have real impact in the lives of millions of Americans. But it was a foundation. It was just the beginning, so we have to continue to fight and to make sure that any of the provisions that weren't included get included.

I just have to say this in closing: This law does not discriminate between Republicans who don't have any insurance, Democrats who have no insurance or who pay too much for their insurance coverage, or tea party activists, Independents; it does not discriminate against anyone with any political affiliation. Whether your Member of Congress voted for this bill or not, you will benefit from this bill.

Each and every American soon will learn that this is not a government takeover. It is not socialized medicine. And due to the hard work and commitment of Democrats, we will finally bring the United States of America into the column of industrialized nations, mind you, which provide affordable and accessible health care for all. This, my colleagues, I think is a remarkable step in the right direction. And so I have to just thank all of those who voted for the bill and thank President Obama for signing it into law. And I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus, especially our Health Task Force, led by our physician, Congresswoman Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN, who really fought each and every day to make sure that we expanded community clinics, ensured that we begin to close these health disparities in communities of color, that our minority medical schools finally receive

some equity in terms of the ability to train more minority medical professionals. So this was a big deal. It is going to kick in over the years up until 2014, but I think that the American people will see why this was well worth fighting for.

Once again, it doesn't matter whether you're a Democrat or a Republican or a tea party activist or an Independent, or whomever, you will benefit from it whether your Member voted for it or not.

Thank you again, Congresswoman FUDGE, for your leadership. And thanks to the Congressional Black Caucus for being such strong advocates for health care reform.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Chair, we would like to thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is probably no one in this caucus who fought harder to get this bill passed. Our Chair, Representative LEE, is one of the hardest working Members of this entire body. She has vision and leadership. And most of all, she has courage.

We want to thank you for being our leader. We thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to my friend who has joined us and has always been a consistent voice for the people of this country, the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank my colleague from Ohio very much, and I am delighted to be able to join her, and as well my chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus and other Members who I know have a great interest in this area of reminding the American people of the great strides that we have made in the passing of this outstanding new attitude for health care in America. It is long overdue, and it was an enormous struggle.

I can remember that weekend of March 2010 and the week that led up to it and the days that we stayed over on Saturday to gather our resources and to continue to work and to push, working and ensuring that the Senate would bring the bill over to the House so on that Sunday, we could cast a vote for what has to be a monumental change in American life and will go down as a monumental move in American history.

Just a few minutes ago, I had the privilege of listening to our Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary Vilsack, and he reminded us of how diverse America is. Rural America, for example, with all of its needs and all of its specialness—of course, just on the floor of the House, we stood in silence to acknowledge the loss of lives in rural Arkansas in a terrible flooding. And then he expressed the inequity in terms of poverty in some of our rural communities and the need for investment in that community. And I would venture to say that alongside of that investment, this health care bill, which as our chairwoman just said, it is not respective of region or what party you're in or who represents your district; you

will have access to health care. That means that many of the rural Americans, some of whom scratch their survival out of the earth, some of whom are still tenant farmers, some may have small family farms, and many of them have sacrificed to invest in those farms and have probably ignored the need for health care because of the cost. Now we have that opportunity to ensure that those Americans, hard-working Americans who put bread on our table, have the ability to provide for their family.

The Secretary made mention of the fact of the First Lady's commitment to, in essence, stamping out obesity, particularly in our children. This health care bill provides for preventative measures, preventative care, and a focus on nutrition and an emphasis on helping children, something long overdue. And it compliments the First Lady's effort and the Secretary of Agriculture's acknowledging that we must have healthy foods, for example, in our school cafeterias to make healthy children. But at the same time, it is important to note that that child who may be obese as we speak should have access to some form of health care.

Now, with the passage of this health care bill, that child will have that opportunity to have a better life, a healthier life, to have a nutrition plan—we don't like to call plans for children diets, but a good healthy nutrition plan that can be governed by their family practitioner now or their pediatrician, to which they will have access, either through the National Exchange or through health care that now this family farm or their family can purchase.

Just a week or so ago, during Memorial Day week, I had the privilege of announcing a \$1 million grant that was to allow an inner city hospital—the only African American hospital in the State of Texas, and one of very few in the Nation—to receive a grant to servicemembers and their families, active duty servicemembers and their families for PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder. We know that is a prominent and prevalent condition that many of our soldiers are coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan and have been impacted by that.

But what about mental health and the need for mental health care across America that people who have had mental health concerns have literally suffered because we never had parity in our health care insurance coverage? It has never been required federally until recently. The legislation, of course, shepherded by the late Senator Ted Kennedy, and our friend and colleague, his son, PATRICK KENNEDY. But for so many years, we did not have mental parity; insurance companies could ignore it. Just think if you would ignore the servicemen and their families who are impacted by post-traumatic stress disorder.

Well, many Americans feel isolated with mental health concerns and not

being able to access good care. This health care bill turns a corner on mental health care, and I want to say to the American public that physical illness has no position to be raised up over a mental health condition. There should be no stigma, and you should have access to as good a care for a physical ailment, a broken arm, an upset stomach, diabetes, kidney disease, terrible diseases, of course, but you should equally have access to mental health care. Well, this health care bill allows that to happen, and I think that that is a step forward for the American people.

It's good to note that families who have raised children who are now entering the work world or looking for work and coming out of college, used to be an enormous burden of, how do I care for my child when they have aged out of my insurance? Well, now we have the opportunity for them to remain on the insurance until 26. But let me give an admonition—and I think this is going to be important for the Congress to do. In the legislation, there are several oversight provisions in the bill—in fact, our own Congressional Black Caucus, working with Congresswoman EDWARDS and some others, were very insistent on making sure that the raising of the cost did not inappropriately or unfairly burden middle class, upper middle class Americans, just by the nature of who it falls on.

But the other aspect of it is, the rumor is that if insurance companies are required to keep children on until they're 26, that ugly word of "increased cost" is going to rise. What I would say is that we need to pay attention to the actuarial tables and the database that suggest how many times a 26-year-old or under utilizes health care and not let insurance companies just willy-nilly on their own regard, on their own basis make the determination, well, they're giving me something to do, I'm going to raise the cost, because that's what people are afraid of. We have to say to the American public, we're going to be your watchdog in the United States Congress and ensure that that doesn't happen.

Let me also take note of the federally qualified health care clinic. I'm excited about that. I debated this some years before when we were talking about trying to put more funding into the legislation to increase the number of federally qualified health clinics even before this health care bill because for a long time, these clinics were not even known about. But the idea to be able to walk out your front door and walk down your block and go to a health care facility that is not an emergency room will make an enormous difference on the healthiness of Americans, preventative care.

Right now I am, in my community, assessing different locations in my congressional district that a federally qualified health clinic would be suitable; the population, the partnership, 501(C)(3)s, and petitioners who would

want that to be in their neighborhood. I'm excited about it. And I'm excited about the Martin Luther King Center. That is a health clinic that I helped fund so many years ago when their doors were about to close. They are not only open today, but they have sprung two more Federally qualified clinics in order to be able to serve the public. This is a good investment.

As was indicated earlier, our small businesses will finally be able to spell the word relief, r-e-l-i-e-f. They will be able to say, I will be able to not only pay for the owners, but my employees will be able to get insurance, and that is a great mechanism. And we should not let anyone, in essence, dump on our parade. We should not let anyone miscalculate or mischaracterize, if you will, how much of an impact the small business tax exemption will be for those small businesses to allow them to be able to provide health insurance for their employees.

□ 2030

Small businesses are the backbone of America. They are probably the largest employers of the American economy. They want to provide insurance for those mothers and fathers who work for them every day, who are committed and dedicated—sometimes they are mothers and fathers with family businesses—and now they will be able to do so, and I believe that is very important.

The doughnut hole was the most horrific vote that was taken here in the United States Congress some years ago, which was for Medicare part D. We lasted on the floor of the House until 6 o'clock because our friends on the other side of the aisle could not get a vote until they squeezed it out of some of our colleagues. It was horrific. For those who don't understand it, it means that you pay for your prescription drugs, which are going through the roof, until you, as a senior, fall in the hole because you've gotten a catastrophic illness, and they will wind up paying for you. What an atrocity. We're going to close that hole in the next 2 years.

As well, right now, seniors should be receiving \$250 checks in their hands. We recognize the undermining of your health care because of Medicare part D. First of all, it was unrealistically expensive, and certainly, it was a plan that we Democrats have indicated was a wrong-headed decision. Obviously, we have been proven right. Part of our deficit, which was spoken so loudly about by the other side of the aisle, was caused by Medicare part D, and the large majority of our party, our caucus, voted against it. Really, it was a wrong-headed direction to take.

Here is another negative that the naysayers would say: well, you can hardly get into doctors' offices today. How are you going to get into their offices now? They're standing in line. I'm afraid that I'm not going to be able to see a doctor.

They were scaring seniors with that kind of information. Well, I think that when people are inclined to serve, there is a great deal of love and affection for the medical profession. Yet one of the reasons we don't have the numbers is that we have not been able to give people opportunities. It is very expensive training, so we will be engaged in providing resources to train nurses, nurse practitioners, and physicians. We will actually have resources to give young people who want to go into that profession.

I spoke at the High School for Health Professions in my district. They have a diverse student body, but many of them are not going into the health profession. Yet many are, and more would if they had the resources to do so. So we are excited about that.

As I focus on closing on some of these points, let me quickly bring something in that you might not think is related to the health care bill, but it is. The BP oil spill is plaguing the gulf coast. More importantly, there is human devastation, if you will. There is the devastation of not working in the shrimping, fishing and oyster industries. There are some energy industry workers who are now not working as well. All of those individuals were probably living off their salaries or off the revenue that they brought in day to day and month to month. I would imagine that some of those individuals did not have health insurance. They might have even been paying a fee for service because they made choices of putting money into businesses as opposed to into health care. Well, now we have an opportunity for these individuals, if they are at risk, to either go into a high-risk pool or to prospectively be able to go into a health exchange to be able to get the most cost-effective health insurance that they might be able to get.

With that in mind, I would like to indict, if you will, those States for refusing to get into the health exchange program, like my State, which has the highest number of uninsured, as evidenced by Dr. Oz, who came to Houston, but also as evidenced by the data that says that Texas needs opportunities for people to be insured. So I would hope that we would have the kind of energy and excitement around this idea of the health exchange so that States would have to engage in it because the people would rise up and would say that they wanted it.

Of course, under this bill, hospitals which have been facing increasing costs with no compensation now will have the opportunity to be paid for uncompensated care. We hope those numbers will go down now because, obviously, if they go down, it will mean more people will have gotten their own insurance; but just in case, these hospitals will have that.

I want to close on these last two points which I think are unique to the Congressional Black Caucus. One is to express great applause to the CBC

Health Care Task Force with Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN and to the Tri-Caucus health effort, because out of that effort came the very important language on disparities or on the continuing work on disparities that we see amongst our minority population, such as with regard to diabetes, kidney failure, heart failure, and such as with regard to devastating breast cancer. These are elements that are clearly as a result of disparities that were not addressed, and I think we will see more opportunities for clinicals where minorities will be used so we will be able to find causes and will begin to find cures for some of these devastating diseases in the minority community.

Lastly, our work is yet unfinished. I worked very hard on the issue of physician-owned hospitals. Many of us thought that the passage of the bill was worthy of our looking down the road and of our making sure that we would cure that problem. It is a serious problem because these hospitals were stigmatized as hospitals that were all for-profit and not for service. I know for a fact that the hospitals that are in the State of Texas which hire or which have at least 40,000-plus employees are serving their constituents with OB/GYN and with full service care. One of the hospitals in my district was the only hospital that had a wing dedicated to H1N1 when it was rampant here in the United States.

I am looking forward to the leaders of these hospitals having the opportunity to come back to Washington to sit down with our leadership and to talk about making sure that these hospitals are not discriminated against as it relates to Medicare reimbursement. Some language allows that to happen in the bill, but it is a very peculiar formula that may not match all of the needs of the constituents who need to be taken care of by these hospitals.

So I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio for her constant leadership. She has a great medical community in Cleveland, a community that certainly was engaged in this process of putting together this very, very strong health care reform bill, historic in its own efforts; and I thank her for her leadership.

My final words are: it is never easy to make hard decisions. We said that as we debated and as we compared this to the 1964 Civil Rights Act and to the 1965 Voting Rights Act. There were many in their home districts who threatened them for taking that vote. Where would America be today if we had not taken the strides to break down the shackles of discrimination to allow all Americans to vote? I hope and I pray and I believe that we will have the same opportunity to look back on history in 2010 and will be able to say how we have changed the lives of Americans and how we have saved the lives of Americans.

With that, I yield back to the gentlelady, and I thank her again for her leadership.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again thank my friend and colleague, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for her insight and for her knowledge, obviously, of the bill as well as for her ability to connect with the American people.

I thank you for joining me this evening. It is always my pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, again tonight, we are going to focus on the benefits of the health care reform that Americans are experiencing today. When it comes to health care reform, what is now called the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, I truly believe history will show those of us who supported it did the right thing, and we are already seeing evidence that our courageous act is positively impacting Americans.

I am extremely proud that Congress took the task of closing the doughnut hole for seniors. The doughnut hole has, in many instances, become the black hole because, for some seniors, the uncovered prescription costs never end. Fortunately, that is about to change. Beginning in 2011, seniors in the doughnut hole will receive a 50 percent discount on prescription drugs. By 2020, the doughnut hole will be completely closed. I know that many seniors cannot afford to wait. To ease the burden, Medicare recipients will automatically receive onetime \$250 checks to help them with prescription costs. Some of those checks have already been received. I know that this is a modest step, but it is the beginning of our commitment to improve Medicare for our seniors, and I am very happy to see that it has started helping some of the 97,000 seniors in my congressional district who receive Medicare. Making prescription drugs more affordable for seniors is only one of the many benefits for seniors included in the recently enacted health reform law.

Other benefits for seniors include free preventative care services. So, if you need screenings or if you want your physical examinations, all of those things become free, and all of those things become free under Medicare beginning in 2011. Extended funding for Medicare is going to be there through 2029. There is going to be increased access to doctors, and we will have expanded home- and community-based services to keep seniors in their homes instead of in nursing homes.

I am also pleased that Americans without insurance and those who have been denied insurance due to pre-existing conditions can now sign up for immediate access to health coverage. This will be done through a temporary high-risk pool until the exchanges are up and running in 2014. This will be a great relief for Americans.

Small businesses are receiving tax credits to assist in providing employees with health coverage. As a result of the health care reform, the Federal Government now offers tax credits of up to 35 percent of the employer premium contributions for those small busi-

nesses that choose to offer coverage. Beginning in 2014, those tax credits will increase to up to 50 percent of employer premium contributions.

Beginning in September of this year, of 2010, just in time for the start of the fall semester for college, young adults will be able to remain on their parents' insurance plans until age 26. The best part is any young adult without employer-provided insurance will be able to remain on their parents' insurance plans up to age 26. The young adults need not be enrolled in college. He or she does not even have to live in the same State as his or her parents. Parents only need to contact their health insurance companies to enroll their children.

Also, our young adults, including former foster youth, will be able to pursue their educations and start their careers without the fear of unexpected medical bills hanging over their heads. Finally, these young people will have access to medical care without fear that they will have bills they cannot afford.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in September, we will also respond to the needs of younger children. Beginning on September 23, the unfair and discriminatory practice of denying children health care due to preexisting conditions will end. No more will insurance companies determine that children who face medical hardship don't deserve affordable health care. No more will private industry decide which children deserve care and which do not.

I held multiple town halls on health care prior to the passage of the bill, and I was moved by the many stories I heard. One in particular came from a father who was barely able to afford health care for his son who suffers from sickle cell anemia. The insurance company found sickle cell to be a pre-existing condition, and as such, the only insurance he could find was astronomical in price. He could not afford it. I am proud that this Congress remedied the situation for this father, who only wanted to give his son a shot at a healthy future.

On September 23, insurance companies will be banned from capping the amount of money they will spend on a patient's care. One of my constituents, whom I will call Mary, is especially excited about this particular provision. Mary has been paying for health care insurance, as well as for catastrophic health care insurance, for many years. She does this in case she hits the lifetime limit. She saw her own brother, who has brain cancer and no health insurance, inundated with medical bills well in excess of \$60,000. She lived in fear that that might happen to her, so she wanted to be sure that she was prepared. Just out of fear that an unpreventable or unexpected illness will force her into financial hardship, she prefers to be safe rather than sorry. Mary has maintained a policy with a \$25,000 deductible—yes, I did say a \$25,000 deductible—just to be sure she

doesn't fall into medical bankruptcy. For her, the countdown for September 23 can't come soon enough.

Beginning on October 1, there will be increases in funding for community health centers to allow for nearly doubling the number of patients served over the next 5 years. For those in Ohio, you can find a community health center near you just by calling 211. There will be scholarships for medical students. There will be new scholarships for loan repayment programs that will be available for doctors, for nurses and for other health care providers who work in underserved areas. To those listening in the 11th District at home, to find a scholarship, visit National Health Service Corps' Web site at nhsc.hrsa.gov. Again, that is nhsc.hrsa.gov.

□ 2045

Next year, in 2011, a public option for long-term care insurance will become available. Further, in 2011, insurance companies will be required to spend 80 to 85 percent of all premiums received on patient care or provide a rebate to customers. Insurance companies can no longer just take inordinate sums of money and put them in their pocket and have nothing to show for the care that they have given to the people who have paid these premiums. Now they must spend at least 80 to 85 percent on care. In 2011, Medicare patients will receive free preventive care.

As President Obama rightly noted, passing health care reform is just the first step. Implementing it in an effective, accountable way is now the challenge and our goal. I am honored and privileged to have voted for health care. We need to remind ourselves reform was necessary and why we fought so hard to insure all Americans.

I want to share the story of a constituent who was diagnosed with cancer when he was almost 15 years of age. This young man—we will call him Steve—should have been worrying about getting his driver's license or what he was going to wear to the homecoming dance or excelling in school. Instead, he was concerned for his very basic survival. Steve and his family were told he only had a 15 percent chance of living because he had a softball-sized tumor which had grown in his ribcage and into his spine. Luckily for Steve, he lived in the Cleveland area. He was being treated at Rainbow Babies and Children's Hospital in Cleveland, which is one of the leading pediatric hospitals in the world. Rainbow Babies is a world-class facility and cares for patients around the world.

The doctors, nurses, and support staff at Rainbow worked miracles on this young man. He had intense chemotherapy and spine surgery, which shrank and ultimately removed the tumor. His bones, which had been eaten away by the aggressive cancer, were replaced with titanium rods. And he started on an 8-week path to learn how to walk again, a remarkable feat

which, at 15 years of age, is something that few would have the emotional and mental maturity to handle, let alone the physical capacity.

Despite the expert care, continuing radiation, and chemotherapy, it was not enough to prevent the relapse that occurs to a majority of patients diagnosed with this cancer. Within 4 months, Steve had to repeat the process of removing yet another tumor. The tumor was removed by Rainbow Babies. Thankfully, this particular type of cancer did not return.

Steve would go on with his studies and graduate high school and stay close to home and go to John Carroll University in University Heights. His life was starting to get back on track, especially for an 18-year-old. He was still worrying about school but adjusting to college life and figuring out what it means to be a young adult. But just as Steve had started his new life, he received devastating news. He was diagnosed with a new and different type of cancer called acute myeloid leukemia, or AML. AML is a blood cancer that required him to have a bone marrow transplant. An anonymous donor and doctors at Rainbow saw him through a successful operation. And thanks to them and the resilience of his family, Steve is now a robust young adult, physically and mentally ready for the challenges that come to college students.

The story of Steve's resilience and his doctors' skill and persistence is a heroic one that can serve as inspiration to all of us. But what makes this story most notable was that much of it was done without the basic protections that should be guaranteed to minors by health insurance.

Steve had exceeded his lifetime insurance limit during his third bout of cancer and, as a full-time student, he was ineligible for his parents' insurance. Steve sums up his own feelings about health care reform with this quote. He says, If you voted for the health reform bill, thank you, because for other kids, teens, and young adults like me, you solved two problems this year: one to prevent insurance companies from having lifetime maximums, and allowing young adults and teens to remain on their parents' coverage until age 26, even if they are not enrolled in postsecondary education.

A story like this, Mr. Speaker, will never need to be repeated again in this Chamber, and that's because of health care reform. I am, again, proud to have been one of the persons who voted in this House to save the lives of so many.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

LESSONS FROM THE PAST

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. It's a treat to be able to join my colleagues this evening as we

take a look at, once again, some of the fundamental questions that we face as a Nation: the questions that center around our budget deficits, the world economy—particularly unemployment in America—and the various policies that are involved in some of these questions. These are things that have absorbed the attention of our Nation now for some period of time because the economy has been very tough. There are many Americans that are hard workers that are out of work, and the condition of our country overall, even particularly various States, is troubling at best, and dire probably would be more accurate.

I think that it's appropriate sometimes just to look back a few years to see where we have come from and also to develop a little wisdom from the past and the lessons that we can learn from the past. I have chosen just to jump in at a particular point, an interesting point in history that I think a lot of people don't know. This isn't really old history. This is things most of us have lived in our own day.

This was September 11, just 2 years after the attack on the Twin Towers, September 11, 2003, the situation chronicled by The New York Times, not exactly a conservative oracle, yet accurately reflecting a proposal, in fact, a plea, from President Bush. This is what the actual text of the article says: The Bush administration today recommended the most significant regulatory overhaul in the housing finance industry since the savings and loan crisis a decade ago.

This is 2003. This is not 2008, when the housing crisis came crashing down upon all of our ears and destroyed the stock market and our economy. It says here: Under the plan disclosed at the congressional hearing today, a new agency would be created within the Treasury Department to assume supervision of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the government-sponsored companies that are the two largest players in the mortgage lending industry.

Freddie and Fannie, for people who have just gotten a little hazy in their memory, of course, were quasi-governmental. They were really private companies, but they were created with almost the implicit assumption that if anything goes wrong, the Federal Government will step in. And what was going on was that going back even before 2003, you had Federal policies. This is closely tied up with the ACORN organization and our President. You had Federal policies that said that banks had to give loans to people who were a very poor risk. There were certain areas of the country where it was very hard to get mortgages and for individuals to buy a house. We felt that home ownership was a good thing, in general. And so the banks, the Congress decided that the banks should be required to make loans to people who may not be able to pay those loans.

So what you have here is social engineering. It reached its height almost

under President Clinton in his last year. And he changed the percentage, saying that the banks have to up the percentage of loans which, by most other economic standards, would be just considered risky or poor loans. Well, what happened was the different bankers and other people who sold the loans took these loans and offered people money to buy houses, even though their credit or perhaps the job they had showed that they could not support that rate of mortgages and mortgage payments. So they sold all these things. But guess who picked up the tab? Well, it was Freddie and Fannie. And Freddie and Fannie got into a huge business of underwriting people's home mortgages, and this grew and grew and grew.

Well, by 2003, even while we were in the height of the real estate boom and it seemed like housing prices were doubling every few years, Freddie and Fannie lost a few billion dollars or so, or a lot of millions of dollars, and that reflected the fact that Freddie and Fannie, in the President's estimation, were in trouble. So the President wanted more authority from Congress to regulate Freddie and Fannie, who were largely private, and the President had no authority to do that. So he is requesting authority.

The response of the Democrats—in this case, particularly the top Democrat in the House at the time was Representative FRANK. He said these two entities, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, are not facing any kind of financial crisis. The more people exaggerate these problems, the more pressure there is on these companies, the less we will see in terms of affordable housing.

Now, of course, 20/20 hindsight, you look back and say, Well, yeah, this isn't a very smart thing to have said because Freddie and Fannie were in huge trouble. They continue to be in huge trouble. They're extended way beyond what they have any means to pay for. They've got lots of debt that they shouldn't have. So there is a huge problem with Freddie and Fannie. But Freddie and Fannie were very popular here in Washington, D.C., because they had hordes of lobbyists with many, many thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars which they gave out to political people in Washington, D.C. So Freddie and Fannie were very popular, and it was quite a number of people, particularly Democrats, said, No, there's no real problem with Freddie and Fannie.

As we know, Freddie and Fannie did have a problem and they're in a tremendous crisis. As that crisis developed, what happens is not only does ACORN and the social engineering threaten just the housing market, but it affected not only just our economy but the entire world economy and created this crisis which started in housing but, unfortunately, did not stay contained just to the housing market.

So we see the beginning of the economic problems that we're experiencing now started with ACORN, started in the housing market.

Now, there are people who say sometimes that this is evidence of the failure of free enterprise. I bristle a little at that because this is not a failure of free enterprise. This is a failure of government social engineering. The loans that didn't work, I suppose that those loans were made in the name of compassion, although I don't know what is compassionate about asking somebody to take a loan and giving them a loan that they can't afford to pay and slowly they get farther and farther behind in debt and eventually get evicted from their house. That doesn't seem, to me, very compassionate.

Anyway, it was this social engineering that got us into trouble. People could not afford to make these loans. And for a while there it got to be a pretty good deal, because you could get a loan where you wouldn't have to make any payments for a couple of years. You could buy a house for \$300,000, make no payments for a couple of years, sell it just about the time you're going to have to make this huge, big mortgage payment, and double your money. That worked okay for a while until the bubble popped. Anyway, we start to get into serious economic problems.

Now, as that continued, it affected other parts of the economy. As people are aware, we had the great big TARP or the big bailout of \$700 billion, something that I did not vote for and many other conservatives did not vote for. We believed that that problem could have been solved by changes in accounting rules, but I won't go into the details of that. Following that, then, is President Obama is elected, recognizing there were some difficulties in the economy. We had unemployment that was getting up there, 7 and 8 percent unemployment. At that time, the President came in and told us that we needed a big stimulus bill.

Now, I have to say that many conservatives are skeptical about "stimulus" bills. Just the premise of the whole idea is flawed.

□ 2100

The government cannot stimulate really the economy; the government can only just create an environment where the private sector can be productive, can produce jobs, can create wealth. But the government cannot create wealth, and it cannot really stimulate. It can only simply take money and spend it.

So this stimulus bill was put together at about, not \$700 billion like the big bailout for Wall Street; this was an even bigger bailout of about \$800 billion. This is what we were told before the bill was passed: Our stimulus plan, this is the Democrats speaking, will likely save or create 3 to 4 million jobs; 90 percent of these jobs will be created in the private sector,

and the remaining 10 percent are mainly public sector jobs. This is President-elect Obama January 10, 2009. And then the Romer Report estimated unemployment without stimulus is 8.8 percent in 2010. So, in other words, we were told, If you don't pass this stimulus bill, what is going to happen is you are going to get unemployment that is going to go as high as 8 percent, so you need to hurry up and pass this big stimulus bill.

Now the stimulus bill was not a stimulus bill. It was an investment in big government. It was an investment in socialism, and it was never going to work. We stood on the floor, I and a number of other Republican colleagues, a year ago and said, This will not work. And it is not because we were geniuses that we knew it would not work; it is just because history shows that this approach is flawed. It doesn't work at all.

So, now as we take a look, the private sector has lost nearly 8 million jobs. They claimed it was going to create three to four in the positive. We have lost 8 million since 2008. The government has gained 656,000 jobs of government employees. A lot of these are temporary Census workers. And in May, only 5 percent of the job creation was in the private sector. In fact, the May unemployment rate was at 8.7 percent, approaching 10 percent. So this stimulus bill didn't work.

Now you could say, how is it you know it wasn't going to work. Well, we know because it has been tried before. It was tried by FDR. In fact, his Secretary of Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, tried this same basic idea. And as a former engineer myself, it is like the concept of reaching down into the loops of your boots and lifting hard and attempting to fly around the room by lifting your own boots.

What they decided to do was, when the economy was having a hard time, with a little bit of coaching from dear little Lord Keynes from England, that what we would do is have the government spend a ton of money, and when the government spent this money, it would get the economy going. It would, quote, stimulate it, and get us back onto a sober track. Well, of course, that is pretty appealing to politicians because you get to be the guys to hand out all of other people's money in giveaways. That is what the stimulus bill included, a lot of handouts to various State governments so that their pensions could be propped up when the State governments had irresponsibly spent pension money that really wasn't there, and promising all kinds of retirees that they could have a much fatter pension than what the government can afford, that and a whole series of other things.

But this bill was not even a classic FDR kind of stimulus bill because that would have been lots of cubic yards of concrete and hydroelectric dams and also lots of roads and sort of public works projects. This stimulus bill was

much longer in increasing sort of welfare-related type of giveaways, giveaways to various States and buttressing and increasing various government handouts. And it was not as long and concrete in those types of jobs.

Be that as it may, we can learn from Henry Morgenthau, if the leading and liberal party in this Capitol can learn from history, but they didn't.

This is Henry Morgenthau going way back to 1939 after the Great Depression, and he appears before the House Ways and Means Committee and he says, We have tried spending money; we are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work.

Now we have read this here on the floor many times, but people in politics don't want to hear it because they like dishing out other people's money.

He continued, I say, after 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and an enormous debt to boot.

It sounds hauntingly familiar; doesn't it? We did the stimulus bill. We created that much more debt, spent \$800 billion, on top of the \$700 billion for the Wall Street bailout; the one was a bailout for big Wall Street firms, the other was a bailout for States and other individuals who spent more money than they should, and so we are supposed to bail them out. How well did it work? Well, Henry Morgenthau said it didn't work. And what do we find? Oh, my goodness, it doesn't work. Our unemployment is higher now than when we spent the money.

So we are saying, okay, is this a failure of free enterprise? No, it is a failure of government to be able to straighten the economy out by taxing people a lot and spending all of their money. That just doesn't work. It may make you popular with the people you give the handouts to, but it does not get the government going. Unemployment, of course, skyrockets.

Now here is the logic of how this thing works. Here is a picture of it graphically. This white line is the private sector level of employment. You can see the drop in employment coming down here in terms of the number of jobs on this axis, and the red line is the increase in government employment. So, as private sector jobs are going down, which means that is where you get tax revenue by people who are making income in their jobs, as the private sector is flat on its back, you see the red line here is government spending for hiring all kinds of different people who work in government.

In fact, some statistics came out the other day saying people who work for the government now on the average are making twice as much as the people working in the private sector. That sounds hauntingly like what is going on in Europe. Obviously, you can't have a whole lot of people working for the government making more money per person than the people in the private sector because pretty soon, there just isn't going to be any more money

in the private sector. Not only will you slow the businesses down that create the jobs, you will kill the businesses dead, and then we will really be going from a recession to more like a great depression.

So here we have the big government Democrat way. We see that this whole plan of stimulating the economy really is a failed scheme. You could say, well, you have your theories; everybody has their theories. But the fact of the matter, we just did this \$800 billion experiment with your money, the taxpayers' money, and it hasn't worked. And the economy has not responded. That shouldn't be anything surprising because in a few minutes, we will get into the logic of how that works and why it doesn't make any sense.

As we continue along after the big proposal for the stimulus plan, we have other major initiatives that the President and Speaker PELOSI and Senator REID have been proposing. The first was this cap-and-tax deal. We saw that last spring a year ago, and that, of course, was to deal with global warming. The theory was, of course, in that, that CO₂ was a very, very bad gas, and it is making the planet heat up at a terribly alarming rate, and we have to reduce the amount of CO₂ that is being created because that is actually going through a feedback loop in our weather system. The CO₂ has a disproportionate amount of leverage and is creating global warming. That is the proposed idea anyway.

If you assume that is true, which as an engineer, I don't believe that is true, certainly the data does not support the radical claims of global warming that we have seen from that community. In fact, we have seen evidence in some of the e-mails of the cheating that was done, where the lab was being fudged and the facts were being skewed in order to make it look like global warming was a bigger problem.

But even if you believed that were true, if you really want to get rid of CO₂, all you have to do is close down some coal-fired power plants and replace them with some nuclear plants. In fact, in America, if you just took 20 percent of our coal-fired plants and changed them to nuclear, it would get rid of the CO₂ produced by every passenger car in America.

Was that what this big old cap-and-tax bill did? No, this bill was huge amounts of government bureaucracy, and it was a huge taxation. It was a big taxation scheme. It was a big power grab by the Federal Government. Would it really reduce CO₂? Probably not.

□ 2110

It just increases the power of Washington, increases taxes. It's of course breaking the President's promise. He said, I will not tax anybody who makes more than \$250,000; and yet this is a tax every time you flip your light switch. So this was one of his initiatives, and he has a whole bunch more. And every

one of these initiatives is carefully crafted, whether they were done intentionally or not I am not saying, but every single one of these things has the effect of further destroying jobs and ruining our economy.

I am joined by a good friend of mine from down in Georgia, my good friend Dr. GINGREY, and we are going to talk a little bit about some of these problems. And then as we start to conclude this evening, we are going to talk about the positive things, the things that can be done to fix this problem. These problems are not things we haven't seen in America.

We have not seen this much gross uncontrolled Federal spending, this much lack of discipline, fiscal discipline in our country any time that I recall. It's been this bad, but that doesn't mean that there aren't solutions and there are things we can do. But we need to do them rapidly and soon.

I would now recognize my good friend, medical doctor and U.S. Congressman from Georgia, a good friend, and a very bright fellow, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri for recognizing me. And just looking at some of the slides that he is presenting in regard to the one that's currently on the easel, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pay close attention to that, the one entitled "Obama Plan Taxes." And the gentleman from Missouri has already explained the bullet points, cap-and-tax, the carbon taxation, health care taxes, employers' tax if they don't offer a government-approved plan, and medical device manufacturers taxed on the sales price of their products, and then of course the last two, the death tax, tax on inheritance, and capital gains tax.

One that's not on that particular slide, Mr. Speaker, that is really troublesome, of course, is raising the tax on dividends from 15 percent to whatever one's marginal rate might be. And with President Obama planning to let the Bush tax cuts expire, that means all the marginal rates will increase, and the highest rate will go up to 39.6 percent. So individuals in that income tax bracket will be paying not only 39 percent on their earned income, but 39.6 percent in fact on capital gains.

What a job killer, Mr. Speaker, to tell people, you know, you're going to have to pay this much to invest. The stock market is already struggling. Do we want to deal it a death blow? It makes no sense whatsoever.

I wanted to, if the gentleman would allow me, and I know we will engage in a colloquy back and forth, but Mr. Speaker, I did want to mention one thing. Maybe it's already been said this evening, but I don't think it can be said too much, and that is the President reneging on his promise to the American people in regard to health care: if you like your health care plan you can keep it, until you can't keep it.

Mr. AKIN. I don't think he added that little piece, did he, until you can't keep it? You can keep it. He didn't add, "until you can't keep it."

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was absolutely right. That was Phil Gingrey's addition to the quote, the President's quote. But what I mean by that, of course, is the fact that under the Medicare Advantage program in particular, a very popular way of receiving health care for our Medicare population, fully 20 percent of the 45 million people who are on Medicare in this country, 20 percent of them choose Medicare Advantage because the advantage is there, the advantage to be able to get an annual physical examination as part of their Medicare benefits, the advantage of being able to have a screening done for a lot of diseases—I am talking obviously about screening for breast cancer, screening for colon cancer—without any copay required. The coverage in many instances of prescription drugs for folks so that they don't have to buy supplemental at about \$130 a month, Mr. Speaker.

The President under ObamaCare and the Democratic majority have cut those programs 17 percent a year. And I know my colleague from Missouri knows this. It adds up in the aggregate over a 10-year period, Mr. Speaker, of a \$130 billion cut to the Medicare Advantage program, 17 percent a year.

Now, when we started this debate, it was implied, maybe correctly, that Medicare Advantage insurance companies that ran these programs for our seniors got reimbursed on average 14 percent more than traditional fee-for-service Medicare expenditures on an annualized basis. Well, why cut it 17 percent if they were getting 14 percent more? If your argument is let's cut the fat out of Medicare Advantage, you cut the fat. And then you are down into the muscle and the gristle and the cartilage, right down almost to the bone.

And in the final analysis, what it means, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is that Medicare Advantage cannot survive. There is no way. And that means that these people, these 20 percent, 11 million of them, many of them in my 11th Congressional District of Georgia, northwest Georgia, are on the Medicare Advantage program, they are going to lose that coverage. It's as simple as that.

And I yield back to my friend. I thank him for allowing me to join him this evening.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate it, Doctor. Certainly as a medical doctor you have been looking very closely over the last year at one of a whole series of these taxes. These things effectively work as taxes. Let's just take, if you will, health care out of the equation, whether people are healthy or get good health coverage.

The point of the matter is that this cap-and-tax is a huge tax that the House passed on the use of energy, which affects anybody who uses energy. You don't have to be very well-

to-do to have a pickup truck and have to drive a long way to a job, and you spend a lot of money in gas or some type of energy. So this is a big tax on energy. This is a big tax on health care.

There is going to be a huge, huge amount of taxes. They tried very hard to make it look like this is a trillion-dollar increase in taxes, and the numbers continue to come out that it's a lot more than that. So there's another tax. And then you have got the death tax, as you mentioned; you have got the capital gains dividend tax, which is one of the main things that helped get the economy going before.

All of these things are boomeranging around, and you finally, when you get done with the whole thing, you end up with a cartoon that some humorous fellow put together here: "Now give me one more good reason why you are not hiring." And you see these bulls coming into the china shop; and you have got cap-and-tax, or cap-and-trade, the health care reform, which is, of course, the biggest, probably the worst, bill we have seen; and then of course the various other taxes that are coming into this. And he says: "Why are you not hiring?"

And of course what's happening is we are doing two things, basically, in the economy. It's very simple. We are spending a whole lot of money, and we are taxing a whole lot. And, historically, that's exactly the wrong thing for us to be doing. And you have all of these taxes, and of course people don't even begin to realize how much that socialized medicine program is going to cost. Other nations have tried it. It's a total budget buster, even though it ruins the quality of health care as well.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If you would leave that cartoon up there just for a second longer. I love that cartoon. It really portrays what's been going on under this administration and the current majority party in Congress.

I mean, this bull in a china shop approach, as this cartoon so adequately depicts, it's like rushing into a situation in a clumsy, haphazard way when the situation that you are going into is very fragile. And it deserves wisdom, and judgment, and temperament, and a measured response so that you don't go in and break all this valuable, fragile china. And the analogy of course would be our economy.

And when you think about some of the bulls that came charging in, what comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Missouri, would be something like the economic stimulus package of almost a trillion dollars that has grown a lot of government jobs, most of them census workers, but very few jobs in the private market. The charging in there with the TARP bailout, \$800 billion. We are going to buy up all these toxic assets, these credit default swaps and all of these

things that none of us really understood when we first started discussing this and how fit Freddie and Fannie had packaged all these mortgages and a lot of them with their very poor credit and not worth a whole lot.

□ 2120

So we were going to buy the TARP. It stands for Toxic Asset Relief Program, and not one toxic asset to this day, and it's been a year and a half since that bill passed, has been purchased.

What we did, we started doling out the money to the nine largest in the country, said, Here, take these hundreds of billions of dollars even if you don't want it; and the poor community banks in my community and your community, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) and other colleagues, all 435 of us, you know, we see struggling, and yet nothing is done to this day to help them.

Again, I thought that slide was a very appropriate segue for me to show, you know, all of this bull-in-a-china-shop spending instead of cutting the deficit.

Mr. AKIN. I'm going to get to that, but one of the things when you do what you're talking about, that bull-in-the-china-shop mentality of just spending money out of control and it's a bailout for big businesses, bailout for Wall Street, bailout for various States, bailout for individuals that didn't save money and we're going to give this and this and this, when the government starts getting into the bailout business—of course it's choosing winners and losers—there are lot of people that are not getting any bailout. They're being expected to pick up the tab for other people's financial errors.

What happens is you start spending all this money, of course if you're running any kind of a responsible operation, you've got to have some sort of a budget saying, you know, how are we going to make this all work, because pretty soon you're going to start giving away more money than you have. In fact, I think somebody was quoted one time saying, the trouble with socialism is pretty soon you run out of other people's money.

So budgets are necessary, and some of our leaders here on the floor, some of the Democrats said they recognize the fact budgets are necessary. The Democrat whip, Congressman HOYER, said the most basic responsibility of governing was a budget. The most basic responsibility of governing. I have to agree with Congressman HOYER. Here's Congressman SPRATT, the head of the House Budget Committee, said, if you can't budget, you can't govern. Those are strong words and they're true words.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Indeed. If the gentleman would yield for a second, and, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is talking about here, these quotes from the Democratic whip at the time but now Democratic majority

leader, the Honorable, and distinguished I might add, STENY HOYER from Maryland and Representative JOHN SPRATT from my—well, I lived 20 years of my life, was born and raised in South Carolina, and I respect JOHN SPRATT and STENY HOYER. I think Members on both sides of the aisle—so you're talking about not a couple of freshmen Members sitting on the back bench. You're talking about the chairman of the Budget Committee, who has been in this body and served with distinction probably for—I'm going to guess JOHN SPRATT has been here 25 years or so, STENY HOYER as well, and we respect them. They're intelligent. They're thoughtful Members, without question. You know, we don't agree with them, we Republicans, Mr. Speaker. A lot of times we will be voting opposite, many times we will be voting opposite.

But for these two gentlemen to have those quotes, this really says something, and the gentleman from Missouri is so right. When they say that—and then today it's like, well, we don't have a budget and, furthermore, we're not going to have one because, well, maybe the gentleman from Missouri would like to talk about that. But I think it needs to be discussed, because if you can't budget, I agree with Mr. HOYER and Mr. SPRATT, you cannot govern.

Mr. AKIN. You know, there's a certain point where if you spend too much money and you try and put a budget together, the train is going to come off the track. I think that's where we are, and that's, I think, the reason why the Democrats said, yeah, you have got to budget. We always had a budget when the Republicans were in the majority and we always had a budget here in the House. It didn't always get through the Senate necessarily, but we had a budget in the House.

We're also joined, as you can see, my friend, by another good friend of ours coming from the State of New Jersey, and that's Congressman GARRETT. And, you know, I have to say that the State of New Jersey has been refreshing in the last year or so with their new Governor showing some fiscal responsibility, just giving heartburn to all the big spending people that want to spend that State into oblivion. And Congressman GARRETT is a good friend of ours, a good, solid, fiscal thinker, and I'm just delighted that you've joined us in our discussion this evening.

I yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Thank you. I wasn't going to start off on that road, but it's probably a good one to talk about for just a moment. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this general issue and being down on the floor bringing an educational point not just to the Members of the Congress who are here or watching back in their offices but the American public as well. So I commend the gentleman.

Yes, I am from the great State of New Jersey, and we have gone through

phenomenally bad fiscal times for the last decade or so in our State that brings us to the brink of economic morass that we're in in the State right now. In one sense, you might say that New Jersey is sort of like a microcosm of the rest of the country, and that is spending beyond its means.

We hear a lot in the news with regard to the great State of California out on the West Coast, and that's simply because the State's so large and the economy is so large. But a lot of the economic funds and the debt limits, New Jersey is actually in a worse state than California is on a per capita basis.

Mr. AKIN. I don't know if that's good bragging rights or not. That's pretty scary.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. New Jersey often says we're number one in a lot of things, and sometimes the things that we're number one in are great but at other times they're not so good, and the debt levels and the responsibilities of the taxpayers of New Jersey to pay them off are quite astounding. And the number that comes to head just as an aside right now is that per family, which is about four people, it's around a hundred thousand dollars, the debt level, if you add the State, counties, and local levels.

Mr. AKIN. So local spending, the average family of four, is a hundred thousand bucks of debt, per family of four?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Right. And if you translate that into if you wanted to go out and get a mortgage on your house right now for a hundred thousand dollars, at around 6 percent, I guess that would translate to around \$600 a month. So that's what we are all on the hook for in the State of New Jersey.

The Federal Government, of course, goes way beyond that, and I don't have to tell you that, but the Federal Government needs to simply do what New Jersey is doing right now and that is begin the process of living within its means. It's not an easy one by any means. That's why our Governor is making—

Mr. AKIN. What would be the first step in living within your means? Would it not be putting a realistic budget together, perhaps?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Well, there you go. It would be, and as a matter of fact, as you know, I serve on the Budget Committee and Chairman SPRATT is the chairman of that committee. We had just this past week the head of the Federal Reserve, Chairman Bernanke, before our committee, and we put that question to him. We asked him a two-step process: What are the financial markets of this country looking for today, and why do you have so much unrest in the financial market? And he basically said it is because of all the uncertainty out there—I'm paraphrasing, if you will. And then we said, well, is it a problem that creates uncertainty, then, if the Federal Government does not make transparent exactly what we are going to be spending,

i.e., present a budget? And he basically says, well, that is one of the elements of uncertainty, absolutely.

Mr. AKIN. I guess he was being gentle at least, trying to give us a little nudge in the right direction.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. He was, and I was being a little bit gentle in those areas. I put a chart on the screen showing where we've been over the last several years because, you know, the Democrat majority always says that they inherited this problem and that all the problems that we're dealing with today are all President Bush's fault. And I put up a little chart on the wall showing going back, I guess it was, from 2000 and 2004 and showing what the budget deficits were, and that was the gray chart. I don't have the chart right here. So it was this big, then it got a little smaller and a little smaller, and then it went to the year 2007 and it got about this level, and 2007 and 2008 it goes basically off the chart.

Mr. AKIN. I think I've got that chart, gentleman. Maybe we'll proceed. I have one other chart here I think that's kind of interesting, because we've heard these statements now from the Democrat leadership saying budgets are critical, and as you know, you know the punch line, the decision is we're not going to have a budget. So here you have, this is *The Hill*, a newspaper. It says, Skipping a budget resolution this year would be unprecedented.

The House has never failed to pass an annual budget resolution since the current budget rules were put into place in 1974, according to Congressional Research Service.

□ 2130

Now, that's a fairly reliable report; at least they can get the history of whether we passed a budget in the House. They said we have always, since 1974, passed a budget, and yet we're not going to pass a budget this year. That's unprecedented.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Again, we are getting back to that issue, Mr. Speaker, of not even having an intention to pass a budget. And I thank the gentleman from Missouri for bringing that point out, that this is the first time at least since 1974. The Congressional Research Service is very accurate in the information they present the Members of Congress.

I was thinking about—it's been in the news so much, Mr. Speaker—the Euro zone. Those countries of the European Union, 27 of them—I guess maybe 23 or 24 are members of the Euro zone. They have that common currency. And the crisis that's going on there in regard to, the acronym is PIIGS, but it stands for the countries of Portugal, Italy, Greece and Spain. I'm forgetting one “I.”

But in any regard, Greece got this massive bailout of something like \$140

billion, and the Euro zone from the International Monetary Fund with them pledged, I think, another \$750 billion worth of bailout because these countries that constitute that acronym PIIGS, their debt ratio to their gross domestic product is so high. Well, look in your own eye. Don't curse the speck in somebody else's eye when you have a plank in your own, as the Bible says. But that's essentially what we are doing, the United States of America. That's what we are doing. Our debt to GDP is what, my colleagues? You can tell me. But it's close to 90 percent, and by 2020, it will be well over 100 percent, if not 150 percent.

I will yield back to let you all discuss that.

Mr. AKIN. I very much appreciate you bringing that up. Actually, I should pay you a few dollars for helping me get to the next slide because I've got a picture of where Greece and Italy and some of the European nations are relative to the U.S., but I will get to that in a minute.

But I think, just before you joined us, my good friend from New Jersey mentioned the level of this deficit spending. And I think it's important to take a look on a bar graph as to what we're looking at here.

I know that President Bush—and as a Republican, I heard this frequently—he was criticized for spending too much money. And I voted against some of those things and think, yeah, we did spend too much money because we had a deficit. But on the other hand, he argued that we had a couple of wars and a bad economy kicking things off. As you can see, the amount of deficit during the George Bush years here was coming down because of the things that they did by reducing taxes. They had the right formula for getting us going in the right direction.

Here was President Bush's worst spending year, his very far worst when Speaker PELOSI was in charge of Congress, so he wasn't getting any help from the Republicans in the House at that point. This was Bush's worst spending year.

And then you come to the first year of President Obama, and he triples the deficit. From about \$450 or so billion of deficit, we go to \$1.4 trillion of deficit right off the bat in the first year. I mean, this is absolutely skyrocket, smashing, incredible levels of spending.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. AKIN. I yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. And you are setting the record straight, but just to elucidate a little bit more on the record as to the process here in the House.

As the gentleman well knows, all appropriation bills, all spending of taxpayers' money originates right here in the House. And who was the person holding the gavel at that time when those spending bills originated from here in the House? Well, it's the gentleman's name who was on the last chart, Chairman SPRATT.

So, on the 2007 year, right down there, that would have been when the Democrats would have been taking control of the Congress. They took control, and so they would have been having the appropriations process that year going forward. And so, realistically, who was responsible for that immediate uptick in the red chart right after that? Well, we didn't have to wait for President Obama to come into office in order to see the control of Congress that changed; that was the Democrat majority. And so although President Bush was still in the White House, where was the spending coming from at that point?

Mr. AKIN. Originated in the House.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Right here in the House.

Mr. AKIN. So that was this one. But what happens when you put Chairman SPRATT together with President Obama?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Off the charts.

Mr. AKIN. Here we go, \$1.4 trillion.

Now, there are different ways of looking at this. When you talk about billions and trillions, for poor little people like me, those numbers are very hard to understand or make much sense out of it. But one way to take a look at it is this deficit as a percent of gross domestic product; that is, all of the goods made in America, what is the ratio? This one, the worst, was 3.1 percent of GDP. President Obama's first year here, where you have total Democrat control, one party rule, you've got \$1.4 trillion, which is, as I recall, 9.9 percent of GDP, which is the highest since World War II. So this stuff is unlike anything we've seen before. And this is part of the reason why the Democrat Party doesn't want to make a budget, because they're really proud of those numbers. If those were my numbers, I'd be scared to death. And I think the American public is concerned about that level of spending.

I was going to jump just to a little bit—I mean, we've been very critical of the fact that we're doing two things wrong in this one-party rule run by the Democrats, and that is too much spending and too much taxing. It shows a tremendous faith on their part of what the Federal Government can do in terms of solving problems. They believe that there isn't any problem that can't be fixed with more taxing and spending; that's where we seem to go.

But let's talk about some stuff that's just so basic that many, many Americans understand this, particularly kids in Georgia or New Jersey or Missouri that have ever run a lemonade stand, just to understand a little bit about how businesses go. And so I put together a list of some of the main things that are job killers because the result of too much spending and too much taxing is there is unemployment. So what is it that kills a job? What is the solution to this problem? I'm an engineer. You're a doctor. And gentlemen, I don't recall—

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I'm a lawyer.

Mr. AKIN. A lawyer. This is almost like one of those jokes, you know.

But anyway, what is it that kills jobs? I've talked to my businessmen in my district, and I've heard this over and over: The first thing is excessive taxation. You take a look at the stimulus bill, huge amounts of Federal spending. You've got the socialized medicine bill. You've got the cap-and-tax bill, all those massive tax increases, capital gains, dividends, death taxes, all these, more and more taxation, heavy taxation. And what does that do? It kills jobs.

Well, why would that be the case? Well, if you're a businessman and you're going to get taxed a lot, it takes your money away from investing back in your own business. And 80 percent of the jobs in America are with companies with 500 or fewer employees, and so if that guy that owns the business, he looks like he's a rich guy. Maybe he's making more than \$250,000 a year. You say, let's tax that guy. But if you tax that guy, then he can't put the money back into building a wing in the business, putting new machine tools in it, or whatever the new technology is, and creating the jobs. And so this taxation inevitably works to create unemployment.

The funny thing is the Democrats can't have it both ways; they can't have a war on business and say they're worried about unemployment, because it's businesses that employ people. They act like there isn't a connection between businesses and the people who get hired by the businesses. So if you tax a business out of business, there won't be any jobs. It's not that complicated. So the solution to these things isn't that complicated. You can't hammer the guys that own the businesses with all these taxes.

Of course, the other problem that we've created economically is that the regulations on the banks are so tight that the small businesses are having trouble getting access to capital. There is a liquidity problem, and that's part of the regulation of the banks and the finance industry, which they've also managed to mess up.

□ 2140

Then, of course, economic uncertainty is a factor, which is where people don't know what's going to happen next. What crazy scheme are we going to do next? Well, it means you're going to hunker down, and you're not going to hire people. Then, of course, red tape and government mandates—all of these things—kill government jobs, and we're doing every one of these things. It's like we've declared war but not on radical Islam. We haven't declared war on Iran, on Iraq or on North Korea. We're declaring war on U.S. businesses.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, this slide, Mr. Speaker, the one that's currently on the easel, is labeled—for our colleagues

if you can't see that—"Close Job Killers," and it has the different bullet points.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the third bullet point, "Economic Uncertainty," may be one of the most important reasons the situation is so bad in our country right now. The gentleman from Missouri referenced kids in New Jersey, in my State of Georgia, and in his State of Missouri who are creating lemonade stands, who are making lemonade. Certainly, the ingenuity of the American people is such that, over the 230-year history of this country, we have made a lot of lemonade—despite being hit with a lot of lemons. Yet that, too, has its limits. When you have excessive taxation, when you have insufficient liquidity, when you have, yes, economic uncertainty, like we have never had in probably 25 years, and when you have red tape and government mandates, you can just make so much lemonade. That's the problem, and it goes back to the slide earlier of the bull in the china shop approach.

Now here, this weekend, all of a sudden, after the President, Mr. Speaker, meets with our Republican leader, Leader BOEHNER, and with Leader HOYER, they're talking about what we can do to cut down on the excessive spending and on all these deficits, the debt. Lo and behold, on Saturday night, out of the blue, having not discussed that on Thursday in the presence of the leaders of this body, President Obama now says we want \$50 billion more, a mini-stimulus if you will, from this Congress in order to shovel it to the States on a temporary basis so we can keep teachers and public defenders and firefighters and all these folks on the job. Yet for how much longer? Then when you pull away and when you spend all of that \$50 billion, who is it on the backs of? Once again, it's on the backs of the States that have to balance their budgets. It is fiscally totally irresponsible.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield, first of all, isn't it amazing that we have gotten to the point where we would say that spending \$50 billion is a mini-stimulus proposal? I know you're doing that flipantly in light of the fact that we have \$700 billion here and \$700 billion there and trillions of dollars by the Federal Reserve, but that is amazing that we've gotten to this point. Perhaps there is so much lemonade that the American public has basically soured on all of this spending that has been going on here.

Not to play the puns any longer, you said earlier that this administration has waged war on business. I guess you could extrapolate that and say they're really waging war on job creation in this country. I think that's issue number one, job creation, because, by waging war against the expansion of businesses out there, that means we're not going to see job creation.

Part of that war is a battle that is going on right now, literally as we

speak. It started on Thursday of last week. It will go on for the next 2 weeks. What I'm talking about, of course, is the conference committee between the House and the Senate on the financial service reform, which is definitely an attack on your second bullet point there—insufficient liquidity.

The bill that came out of the House and out of the Senate, under the majority party, will restrict liquidity; and it will restrict credit in the credit markets across this country. It will do so on a whole host of fronts whether it's through the Federal Reserve activities, whether it's through the CFPB, or whether it's through the regulations of the derivative markets; and I can just go down the list.

What does all that mean to you, to me, and to all the folks back home?

It means it will be harder to go out and get that auto loan. It will be harder to go out and get that home equity loan. It will be harder to go out and get that mortgage so you can buy a new house. It will be harder for that small business that wants to buy a new truck so it can hire one more person to drive that truck to do business. It will be harder for that small business to get a loan to expand its operation. All of those things—a lack of liquidity and the tightening of the credit markets—will hurt business, and it will hurt job creation. That is what is going to be rolling out, unfortunately, in the next couple of weeks here in Congress.

Mr. AKIN. Gentlemen, fortunately for you, or maybe unfortunately for you, you are on the committee that is dealing with that. To me—and just tell me if I'm confused about this because I work more of the Armed Services side of things and the national security and the national defense side, and we've got a lot of bad news over there, but I'm not going to share that tonight.

There is an irony here that the Federal Reserve has created this huge, massive liquidity. Yet it's like they've choked the funnel off so tightly that the liquidity can't drip down. The Democrats used to talk about trickle-down economics. I mean, this truly is kind of a trickle-down scheme. You have all this liquidity created by the Fed. Yet it can't get down to the small business guy because, I assume, that part of this is the banking regulators and the banking policies that are saying to the local banks, That's not a good enough amount of security on that loan. You've got to go back because that loan is upside down. Even though that business has been there for 100 years, even though you know the family, even though you know they're going to pay off, even though they always pay on time, it's not good enough. You've got to go get a whole bunch more cash from them to make your books look right for your bank.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I think, if a bank were standing here with us, it would say, Well, look at bullet point No. 3, "Economic Uncertainty." It would say, With so much

coming out of Washington that is uncertain, we have no idea, A, what the rules are going to be tomorrow and, B, what the economy is going to be tomorrow. So they would argue that they're trying to do the prudent thing, the safe thing and say, We're not going to loan to that person who, under normal circumstances, we would loan to.

So you are absolutely right. The Fed theoretically is trying to provide liquidity, but the banks are saying, Whoa, not under this set of playing rules, which may change tomorrow or which may change next week. So the Federal Government is exacerbating the problem that they created in the first place.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I appreciate your perspective there, particularly with your working on that committee. That is very helpful.

Here are a couple of other charts that I thought were interesting. This gives a little bit of a sense of progress on a 20-year increment. This is 1970. The foreign holdings of our debt were 5 percent. This is who owns our debt. Foreign holdings were 5 percent in 1970. Jump forward 20 years to 1990. Foreign holdings were 19 percent. In 2010, foreign holdings are 47 percent. So not only are we being asked to pass another one of these stimulus bills to bail out these States that have been irresponsible in managing their pensions, but we are now asking foreign countries to come in and to underwrite our silly economic policies.

Now, after a while, these foreign countries are going to ask, Wait a minute. What's going on over there? What are you guys thinking?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, I know that time is short, but this is the whole point.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I talked about the euro zone in Greece. The country of Greece has had their credit rating downgraded. So any country that would lend them money—buy their financial paper—will have to charge a higher rate of interest. I think the gentleman from Missouri and my colleague from New Jersey would probably agree with me that, pretty soon, that very same thing could happen to our country. They would agree that our debt is not as credit-worthy as it has been and that, all of a sudden, we are going to have to pay a higher rate of interest to borrow money.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I promised the gentleman that we did have a chart that was taking a look at these foreign countries. We've taken a look at Greece, and Greece has been in the news because it has just created shock waves in Europe as to how it has been affecting their economic system.

This is the deficit as a percent of GDP. I mentioned that, as to where we are in the United States, which is at that \$1.4 trillion level that we just saw last year and at another even higher year this year, we are at about a 10.3 deficit as a percent of GDP. Greece is

at 9.4. So our deficit, as a percent of GDP, is worse than that of Greece. Spain and the United Kingdom seem to be worse off than we are, but we are the next worse on this chart with regard to the deficit.

If you go to debt as a percent of GDP, you've got the United States here. Greece is ahead of us there, and Italy is ahead of us, but we're ahead of the other European countries as well. So this isn't exactly a cheery picture of the job we should be doing in terms of management.

We are coming close on time here, and I have one other chart here, which is that of our corporate tax rates. The green one over on the right is the second highest corporate tax of any nation in the country.

So what's the solution?

I promised we'd deal a little bit with solution. The solution is quite simply that you've got to cut spending and that you've got to cut taxes. If the Democrats could not learn from Ronald Reagan or from Bush when they cut taxes and restored the economy, they should learn from JFK, who did the very same thing. Here is an example of this. It's called the "Laffer curve." You can see that this red is the tax rate. As the tax rate comes down, the bar chart shows the total Federal savings in receipts, so we actually get more revenues in. When you drop taxes, you get more revenue.

So the solution has been demonstrated by JFK, by Ronald Reagan, and by Bush. They turned economies around. Instead of doing what FDR did, which is what Henry Morgenthau told us would not work, you can simply do this: what you do is you've got to drop the tax rate and drop government spending. The trouble with dropping government spending is you can't do giveaways to everybody and do bailouts to everybody.

So what's going to happen here?

America is in the cross-hairs of a choice. We're either going to choose to follow—because there are two U.S.s: one U.S. had the idea that government is going to provide health care and education and jobs and food and housing. The other U.S. said that we believe the job of government is to provide life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That is a very narrow description of government—just national defense and a level playing field. Those are the two U.S.s. The one is, of course, the USSR, and that system didn't work. The other is the one that has worked for hundreds of years.

We need to get back to that idea of a limited government, doing just what it is supposed to do constitutionally and not try to be the bailout king of the entire world and of the entire country.

□ 2150

I thank my good friend, Congressman GINGREY from Georgia, for your insight, and not only your medical professionalism but the way that you've run your office. And the same thing for

my good friend from New Jersey, Congressman GARRETT. Thank you so much for joining us tonight.

Good night, and God bless all of America.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my privilege and honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House tonight and to pick up on some subject matter. I think my colleagues that spoke on the previous hour covered that subject matter pretty clearly and very well, the matter of global finances and the broader picture that we're working with. For me, I come here tonight with a number of things on my mind and things that are fresh on my mind, Mr. Speaker. They have to do with the immigration situation here in the United States.

Having had a long history with this subject matter, when I first came to this Congress, I recall listening to Congressman Tom Tancredo here on the floor. I actually was in my office and watching on C-SPAN and I thought, Well, this is a piece of history in the making. And so I walked over here and into the Capitol Chamber and sat here to listen to him speak. Tom, knowing the rhythm of the place here, saw me in the Chamber and concluded I came over because I had some things to say. He recognized me to speak on the subject matter of immigration. I was not preparing to do so, although I happen to have been prepared because of the issues in mind. From those days on forward, I have been active on this issue in my time here in Congress.

I happen to have had the privilege of sharing the stage with Congressman Tancredo Saturday night in Phoenix. It was the same good man with a passion and a great heart; a man that understands America, the need to have a sovereign Nation, a need to control our borders, a need to have a network across this country of all levels of law enforcement working together to enforce the law, the rule of law—I should say, reestablish the rule of law here in the United States—and build a greater country than we are today, Mr. Speaker.

It was a refreshing thing for me to hear those words again come out of the mouth of my good friend Congressman Tom Tancredo and to share some time on that microphone with Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County in Arizona, who has a national reputation for enforcing immigration law, for establishing and building Tent City. And when Sheriff Joe, when he asked me if I had been to visit—and actually I had. He had sent a guide to take me to Tent City last year and presented me with a pair of his autographed underwear. When he found out I have that in my

office in safekeeping, I was his good friend, Mr. Speaker. That tent city was built because a judge ordered that the prisons provide more space; and the choice was, apparently, to turn some people loose, spend a lot of millions of dollars to put up a structure, or set up a tent city. They did what they needed to do to enforce the law, especially down in that climate, Mr. Speaker.

I also was able to share a microphone with State Senator Russell Pearce, who is the principal author of Arizona immigration law S. 1070, and to spend several hours probing his intellect, his sense of history, and his patriotism that runs so deep for America, and his dedication to the United States of America, the rule of law, the State of Arizona. Put those pieces together, and I looked across at the faces that filled the park grounds there next to the State Capitol in Phoenix, Arizona. A lot of red, white, and blue. A lot of the yellow Gadsden flags; the Don't Tread on Me flags, flying in the light breeze that we had there.

It was an event to remember, with people just clear out to the outside edges of the park; a good, respectable crowd that was there. People came from many of the States of the Union. This time, I don't know that it's all the States but many of the States. A lot from Florida came all the way to Arizona to express their support for S. 1070, for the law that was principally drafted and pushed through into legislation by State Senator Russell Pearce. And he went out to bounce his legislation off of the best experts he could find in America.

And I do give great credit to Governor Jan Brewer for signing and supporting Arizona's immigration law. It is a law that has been misinterpreted, I think willfully, by people on the other side of the aisle. But here's what it is. It is a mirror of Federal legislation. It doesn't go beyond the limits of Federal legislation. It's written within the limits that are there. And it simply says that Arizona law enforcement is going to enforce Federal immigration law.

Now, if you remember, Mr. Speaker, there seemed to have been a grudge match or something going on between now Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano, former Governor of Arizona, and Sheriff Joe Arpaio, the sheriff of Maricopa County. But when Janet Napolitano became the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, shortly after that she announced an initiative to look at how they were going to make some changes in the 287(g) law. The 287(g) law is the Federal law that provides Federal assistance to train local law enforcement officers so that they are well trained and certified to enforce Federal immigration law. And then it makes a commitment for ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, to work in cooperation with the local law enforcement that has a memorandum of understanding that is the 287(g)—that's the section in the Federal code—that is an understanding that they now have

reached an agreement where they're going to work and cooperate together.

There are a lot of jurisdictions in America that had 287(g) agreements. What it is, it's a commitment for the local law enforcement to enforce and support Federal immigration law. It's that simple.

Now, you don't have to have a 287(g) agreement in order to have local law enforcement enforce Federal immigration law. In fact, there's an Attorney General's opinion that was written under John Ashcroft that makes it clear that local law enforcement can enforce Federal immigration law. There are a number of pieces of Federal case law out there that address this. One of them would be a 2001 case, the 10th Circuit, and it's *U.S. v. Santana-Garcia*.

In case you want to look that up tonight, Mr. Speaker, if you're having trouble sleeping, I just will tell you simply what that says is that the Federal court, the 10th Circuit, has concluded that it is implicit that local law enforcement has the authority to enforce Federal immigration law, that it wasn't contemplated otherwise. And I would go further and say that if there's something implicit that local law enforcement can't enforce Federal law, does that mean then that if there is a Federal officer that's being assaulted or that is murdered by someone that we can't have local law enforcement pick them up, that it's a Federal crime so, therefore, only Federal officers can enforce Federal crime? If it's a national bank that would be robbed, could the county sheriffs pick up those bank robbers and support the violation of the Federal law against robbing Federal banks or would you have to wait until the FBI showed up to be able to pick up the robbers of the Federal banks?

By the same token, if it's a city ordinance that's being violated, can the State highway patrol enforce a city ordinance? I will suggest that yes, they should do that. They should do that when that becomes an obligation of their job. When there's a law being broken in front of them, they should enforce that law. If the speed limits are written by either the State or the city or perhaps county on county roads, if those are the speed limits set, does that mean the county sheriffs and deputies and people can enforce speed limit laws only on county highways but they can't do so on city streets or State highways?

I mean, it borders on ludicrous to make the argument that immigration law has been, up until this time, Federal. Therefore, the only people that can enforce it are Federal officials, and they only would be the ones who were trained within ICE and Border Patrol and Customs and border protection to enforce immigration law. It's ludicrous to believe that. There has to be a network of law enforcement working in conjunction, from city police to county sheriffs to highway patrol, departments of criminal investigation, all of

our Federal officers working in cooperation with each other with great profound respect for the Constitution of the United States, for the laws that are duly passed here in the United States Congress and those laws that are passed in the State legislatures, the ordinances that come from the cities, and the list goes on.

□ 2200

So it is a cooperative effort. It always has been a cooperative effort for law enforcement to work together, and it cannot be such a thing as we are going to separate statutes by the jurisdiction of the entity that passed the law. If we do that, then we will have law enforcement officers who watch crimes before their very eyes but don't enforce the law.

Mr. Speaker, that would be the circumstances that take place in sanctuary cities now, sanctuary cities across the country that number by name, places like Houston or Denver or San Francisco. Many other cities have established sanctuary city ordinances that would tell their local law enforcement, Do not work or cooperate in the Federal immigration law. And even though the 1996 Immigration Reform Act that was passed into law, and much of that work was done by now the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), who deserves a lot of credit for language that is there, there is language in that 1996 Immigration Reform Act that prohibits the cities from establishing sanctuary cities.

I don't have the language in front of me, Mr. Speaker, but it is language that says to the effect that you cannot prohibit your officers from enforcing Federal immigration law or working in cooperation with. But the problem is that those cities got together that wanted to have a sanctuary policy, and apparently, they found out the same lawyer or lawyers, or sent out a memo to the League of Cities or whatever ties these larger cities together. And they found a way to write an ordinance around the Federal language, and they prohibited their officers from gathering information. And because they were prohibited from gathering, they didn't have any information to pass on and share with ICE and the other law enforcement officers when it came to immigration.

It created this thing called sanctuary cities. And so they have said that they are not going to enforce the immigration law within these cities. And what would happen? Of course, you create a magnet for illegals to go to those cities where they are sheltered by the sanctuary city language.

And we have, out of the House of Representatives, several times passed amendments on appropriations bills that prohibited any of those dollars coming out of those bills from being distributed to the cities that have jurisdictions where they passed sanctuary language and made sanctuary

cities. But it never made it through the Senate, and it never made it into law.

So we have city after city that protects illegals within them because there is a political base already there for illegals. And in Arizona, what they have done is, S. 1070, in effect, it invalidates any city that wants to provide a sanctuary city, and simply requires them to enforce immigration law by their local law enforcement. And if they refuse or fail to do so, it allows a citizen to have standing to bring a lawsuit against that entity, against that city or county that is not enforcing the immigration law, not inquiring as to the legal status of the people that they encounter in the course of their normal law enforcement duties. I think that is a good thing.

Once 1070 is implemented into law, which I think will be on the last day of July of this year, then you will see the sanctuary cities that happen to exist in Arizona, that will shut down, and they will be compelled to enforce the law, or they are going to be brought into court by the people of Arizona.

But the uproar, the objection hasn't been about shutting off sanctuary cities in Arizona; it has been about whether there would be a boycott of Arizona because some claim that the Arizona law will bring about racial discrimination profiling.

Well, first, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that profiling has always been an important component of legitimate law enforcement. If you can't profile someone, you can't use those commonsense indicators that are before your very eyes.

Now, I think it is wrong to use racial profiling for the reasons of discriminating against people, but it is not wrong to use race or other indicators for the sake of identifying people that are violating the law.

Now we all get profiled. I had a moment of irony this morning when I stepped out of the USDA building down here several blocks west of the Capitol. I was wearing a suit, and I had just stepped out to the sidewalk. I hadn't even looked for a cab. I started to walk down the street thinking I would go to the corner. There was a cab going the other direction on the opposite side of the street. He tapped his horn. I looked up, and he swung around the street and picked me up. I asked, How did you identify me as someone who needed a cab ride? I hadn't indicated I wanted one. I was walking down the street.

He said, Well, you were wearing a suit and you stepped out the USDA office. There wasn't a car there to pick you up; I knew you needed a cab. He profiled me. He said, I don't stop for people wearing shorts and sneakers because they are not looking for a ride. People in suits coming out of that building are. There I was, profiled because I was a guy in a suit at a time of day when it would be logical I would be looking for a ride somewhere.

It is just a commonsense thing. Law enforcement needs to use commonsense

indicators. Those commonsense indicators are all kinds of things, from what kind of clothes people wear, the suit in my case, what kind of shoes people wear, what kind of accent they have, the type of grooming that they might have. There are all kinds of indicators there, and sometimes it is just a sixth sense, and they can't put their finger on it.

But these law enforcement officers, if they were going to be discriminating against people on the sole basis of race, singling people out, that would be going on already. And we would have already the files of the objections that are taking place.

But this is about a political argument. It is not about Arizona's law being unconstitutional or preempted by Federal law or somehow had stretched the bounds that have been set by case law that is out there. It is not about any of that. They would like to say it is; in fact, they have said that it is.

But what it is about, Mr. Speaker, is about making a political argument that would like to brand Republicans as being anti-people because of race.

Now, could this happen? Could anyone start an agenda here to try to brand people and try to scare the American people on the subject of race or the subject of immigration? My answer to that is, You bet. I have seen it happen. It started here on this floor right over here, in 2006, when in the early summer, if I remember my dates correctly, we passed immigration reform legislation out of here headed up by at that time chairman of the Judiciary Committee JIM SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin. Of the things that it did, it was enforcement of immigration law. In the original bill, it made it a felony to cross into the United States illegally. To sneak into the United States, it made it a felony. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) sensed that that would be a highly contested issue if it became law, and so he offered an amendment to strike the language that made it a felony to enter the United States illegally.

Now, had Mr. SENSENBRENNER's amendment passed, then it would have eliminated the language that made it a felony to enter the United States illegally. JIM SENSENBRENNER argued vociferously in favor of his amendment. He didn't actually convince me, by the way, but he understood what was going on. And when the vote went up on the board, 194 Democrats voted "no" on the Sensenbrenner amendment, which can only be concluded that they wanted it to be a felony to enter the United States illegally. And it is a crime, but it is not a felony. So 194 Democrats voted to make it a felony when they voted "no" on the Sensenbrenner amendment. And that Sensenbrenner amendment failed. And when it failed, brought down by Democrats, the streets filled up with protesters protesting that Republicans wanted to make it a felony to enter the United

States illegally; 194 Democrats wanted to, and almost all of them demagogued Republicans for the language that was in the bill when they had voted to keep the language in the bill.

It was completely cynical. They knew it. You all knew it, and there isn't anybody in this Congress that can challenge this statement. And I would be happy to yield to anybody who has a different perspective on this. I watched it happen. I was in the middle of it. And I watched the streets fill up with people that were storming in the streets, first with Mexican flags and then with white T-shirts and carrying American flags. And as they lined up for the protest, the organizers were taking their Mexican flags out of their hands, handing them an American flag, saying put on this white T-shirt, come out here and protest against these evil Republicans that want to make it a felony to enter the United States illegally.

□ 2210

It doesn't bother me that there is a little upset and turmoil in the streets if that's the case. We need tighter immigration laws. We need more tools to work with, not less. But my point, Mr. Speaker, is the very cynicism of voting one way and arguing the other way: 194 Democrats, and they turned and pointed their fingers at Republicans and said, You wanted to make it a felony. They brought down the amendment. It is a fact. It's a fact in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

So here we are now in 2010. No legislation of significance on immigration has been passed since then. It didn't happen in 2006 or 2007. The switchboards of the United States Senate were shut down at two different times during those years because the American people reject the idea of amnesty.

And I have watched immigration at the Federal level be enforced less with each administration since Ronald Reagan signed the 1986 amnesty act. But he was straight up and honest enough to declare it to be an amnesty act, Mr. Speaker. The 1986 amnesty act was the last amnesty. It was the amnesty to end all amnesties, and President Reagan signed it because he believed that there wouldn't be another amnesty.

It was supposed to be amnesty for about a million people. Turned out to be amnesty for about 3 million people by the time the system was gamed and the fraudulent documents and the people came out of the shadows. And 3 million people went through to receive the amnesty in '86, three times the number that they anticipated.

And we have had six lesser amnesties since then that aren't published very much. So we have had a continuous series of amnesties. And it's going to continue until such time as either nobody wants to come to the United States, or until such time as we simply give up on the idea that we can control our borders, or until we establish that

we are going to enforce immigration law and we are going to stand by the rule of law and we are not going to equivocate and we are not going to compromise.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is where I stand. I refuse to equivocate, I refuse to compromise on the rule of law, I refuse to grant amnesty. And we should talk about what amnesty is. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration law-breakers and reward them with the objective of their crimes.

Now, I don't know necessarily what their objectives are. It may be a path to citizenship. It might be a job. They might want to have access to the United States to do philanthropic good things. Or they might want to have access to the United States so they can travel back and forth into the United States hauling illegal drugs into America. And that happens a lot.

A couple of nights ago on Sean Hannity's program you could see the video that he ran, and you could see the backpackers coming into the United States with roughly 50 pounds of marijuana bound in a burlap bundle on their back with straps that might be woolen scarves used for straps, makeshift backpacks. And you might see 10 or 15 or 20 or more all in a row each carrying their 50 or more pounds of marijuana on their back. And this goes on night after night after night, Mr. Speaker. It goes on every night.

And I have gone down and sat on the border in the dark, sat there quietly, didn't have night vision equipment, and just listened, and just listened as the vehicles came down, they let people off, they would set their pack out on the ground. You could hear the packs thump when they set them on the ground. They would get out of the vehicle. They would talk a little bit. Somebody would hush them up. They would close the doors on the vehicle. You could hear that. They would hoist their packs up, put them on their back, and they would march through the mesquite, come across the border.

And when you sit by a barbed wire fence that's got four or five barbs on it and a steel post, you can listen to the posts and you can hear the wire when it stretches. And you can tell each time somebody crosses the fence, and you can count them. And at night I never trust my eyes to be able to actually give an accurate count. I see the shadows, but shadows are not clear enough for me to tell you how many. I can tell you I have heard the noise, I have seen the shadows, I have listened to the same rhythm come over and over again.

I have gone up through the stream beds that are in the desert and there seen where they have dropped off many of their clothes that are unnecessary, empty water jugs. When they unload the packs, the burlap bags that they are in will be dropped there. There will be food that's dropped off, some that's been eaten, some that's been left partially eaten, and some of it left. The desert is full of smugglers' litter.

And if one would go down to the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument down there where Kris Eggles was killed by an illegal, and he was a National Park Officer ranger, there is a monument to him at the headquarters at Organ Pipe Cactus, but there is a large percentage of Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, and that's a national park called a monument that's off limits to Americans. And I am guessing at the area. I know it's the southern side of it. And it seems to me that as I looked at the map, about 40 percent of Organ Pipe Cactus is off limits to Americans because it's full of litter, it's full of drug smugglers' litter. It's drug smugglers' gulch there. And it is too dangerous for people that are out just enjoying the desert to walk down into. And it's too full of litter. And we don't have the labor to go pick up the mess. And if we did, the mess is accumulating day by day, every day, every night.

And the numbers of people that have been crossing the border illegally, we could take the information that comes from Secretary Napolitano, I suppose, and accept it at face value. They would argue that their interdictions on the border have gone down significantly over the last year. And they claim that because they are arresting fewer people on the border that there is fewer border crossings. Now, that may be true. I don't know what's true.

But to use the data that shows that there are fewer interdictions of illegal border crossers to conclude that there are fewer crossing attempts isn't necessarily a logical or rational approach. It could also be that they are just simply not enforcing the law as aggressively as they were a couple of years ago when the numbers were higher. I don't know the answer to that question.

But when the Bush administration used the same argument, I had the same questions. Just because you arrest fewer people doesn't mean there are fewer people crossing. It might mean you are just not arresting as many people. But here are the numbers that came before the Immigration Subcommittee in testimony from witnesses that had represented our Federal Government. And I am including Border Patrol officers. The number of interdictions they believed turned out to be they were stopping about one out of four. Twenty-five percent of border crossing attempts were being stopped.

If you do the math on the stops that they had, that means that there were 11,000 a night on average every night. Not during the day so much. At night 11,000. And that turns out to be four million illegal border crossings a year. And when I go to the border and talk to the people that are enforcing the border and I tell them, so you are stopping about one out of four, you are getting 25 percent of those that attempt. And they look at me and laugh. It's not 25 percent. The most consistent number I get from the people that are hands-on is maybe they stop 10 percent.

If you go to some of the other officers there that are not quite as optimistic, they will take that number down to 2 to 3 percent. But I have never heard an officer that works the border regularly tell me that they stopped 25 percent. And I don't believe I have heard a number higher than 10. So I will tell you I think it's 10 percent that get stopped, not 25. That's still a whole lot that get through.

If it's 4 million attempts and we stop 25 percent, that means 3 million actually get through into the United States. And, yes, a lot of them go back to Mexico and flow back and forth. A lot of them are drug smugglers. They do that for a living.

The people that are working our law enforcement in the desert tell me that they will catch some of these drug smugglers and maybe they will have somebody that only weighs—young men, 15, 16, 18, and they get older—weighing 100 pounds, 105 pounds, not very big people, wiry, tough, with great big calves on them carrying half their body weight or more in marijuana on their back through the desert 70 or 100 miles. Tough people that can cover a lot of territory with a lot of weight on them. And this goes on night after night after night every night.

And does America know, Mr. Speaker, that in some of the sectors on our southern border the policy is that if we catch somebody that has less than 500 pounds of marijuana on them we just simply take the marijuana off their hands and turn them loose? That there is not a prosecution for the drug possession in many of the sectors on the southern border because they argue that they don't have the jail space, they don't have the prosecutorial time, and they don't have the judges to deal with this? And I am convinced that this is true, Mr. Speaker.

I hear this as not necessarily testimony before the committee, but I hear it come out of the people that have to live underneath it. And I was down there and watched an interdiction take place. And I helped unload the bundles of marijuana from underneath the false bed of a pickup truck, and this was down near Sells, Arizona. It was roughly 240 pounds of marijuana in there. And that would have been under the amount that they would be prosecuted for at the time. They have since raised that threshold. It was 250 at the time I was there. Now the threshold in some of those sectors has been raised to 500 pounds.

Now, where I come from, if it's an ounce or a half an ounce or any little particle, that's something to prosecute for. That's the rule of law. But the rule of law has been stretched to the point of ridiculous on our southern border, and the lawlessness from across the border in Mexico is flowing over into the United States.

□ 2220

The murders, the intimidation, the deaths are taking it out in the lives of

our law enforcement officers, innocent American people who are being murdered, who are being raped, who are being targeted as victims to crime that makes Phoenix, Arizona, the No. 2 capital of kidnapping in the world. Phoenix, Arizona, the No. 2 capital of kidnapping in the world. Does anybody believe that if we could enforce our immigration at the border that Phoenix would be the No. 2 capital of kidnapping in the world?

Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico. That means across our southern border, 90 percent of the illegal drugs.

I pointed out that we have 4 million—the number is probably down a little bit from that, but I don't have any other data—4 million illegal border crossing attempts a year, and maybe we stop 10 percent. So that means that we still have a number that is about 3.6 million successful border crossings a year, a 10 percent interdiction rate, 3.6 million. Now, just the attempts, I did the math and I said it was 11,000 a night every night. One might take a look, what was the size of Santa Anna's army? Well, 4,000 to 6,000. So we're looking at a number every single night that I will say is probably twice the size of Santa Anna's army, every single night pouring across our southern border, bringing in 90 percent of the illegal drugs in America. We are importing the violence and the death that goes with the illegal drug trade, and still, this President's heart is hardened.

So the President scares the American people by telling us that a mother and her daughter could be going out to get some ice cream and be pulled over and stopped and asked to produce their papers based upon a presumption of their skin color. Where is that in the Arizona law? It specifically prohibits such a thing, specifically prohibits.

Then, as the President of the United States had his shot or two shots at Arizona, he ordered the Attorney General of the United States to use the resources of the Department of Justice to seek to invalidate Arizona's immigration law. So when Attorney General Eric Holder came before the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago, just before the Memorial Day break, to testify before the committee, he knew that Arizona's immigration law would come up before the committee, that that would be a subject matter that he would be questioned about. It was his job to be briefed on the subject matter so he could answer in an informed, intelligent way.

So as the subject came up, I asked the Attorney General if the President had ordered that he use the Justice Department to seek to invalidate Arizona's immigration law. I can't quote back into this RECORD his exact quote in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can tell you he didn't dispute that. So it was at least by assent that twice the Attorney General acknowledged that the President had directed him.

Now, this is supposed to be a Justice Department that's independent from politics, a Justice Department that makes its decisions based upon the law, an objective evaluation of the law, and, by the way, a Justice Department that has an obligation to enforce the law. These are not policy setters. The President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, is not to be a policy setter when it comes to areas where the Congress has legislated. That's what we do here. We set policy. We set policy here in the United States Congress. That's part of the separation of powers.

Just at the risk of being redundant, everybody in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, should know this. I think it's getting harder and harder to teach government class in our schools today because of the conduct of especially our executive branch of government. The separation of powers, the judicial branch of government will take care of things that have to do with the courts. The legislative branch of government, the House, down that hall, the Senate, we pass the legislation. We set the policy. We write the laws. The executive branch of government's job is to see that those laws are faithfully upheld, enforce the law, carry out the policy, the will of the people of the United States of America as expressed to the Republic, the constitutional Republic, the representatives that are elected by the people.

Yet, we have Members of the executive branch of government as high as the President, himself, who seem to not understand that simple concept. A President who taught Constitution law at the University of Chicago is still a President that would tell America that a mother taking her daughter to get some ice cream could have a problem and have to produce their papers. This is misinforming the American people. Is it willful? In his case, I don't know. I think when he said that he had not read the bill, and a week or so later he uttered a mitigating statement that indicated to me that either he was briefed or he might have read the bill.

But Eric Holder, the Attorney General, to come before the Judiciary Committee, and when I asked him the question, So you have directed the Justice Department to seek to invalidate the Arizona immigration law and to test it constitutionally or statutorily or by case law, could you point to me, General Holder, a place in the Constitution that gives you concern that Arizona's immigration law might be unconstitutional? No, he could not.

Could you, General Holder, point to a Federal statute that would preempt Arizona's immigration law? He could not.

Could you then, General, point to some case law that would be controlling and limit Arizona's ability to pass immigration enforcement law at the State level? He could not. The Attorney General of the United States could not point to even a potential constitutional violation or a statute that could

preempt Arizona's immigration law or any case law that would control, none of it whatsoever. Yet he was still committed and still taking the resources of the taxpayers of the United States of America to seek to invalidate Arizona's immigration law and bring suit against Arizona. And that's what he seems to be doing.

There is a draft memo out there—it's not the exact word for it. It's a draft something, Mr. Speaker, that is a product of the Justice Department now that apparently lays out the parameters by which the Justice Department would bring suit against Arizona to invalidate their immigration law, and here's what I believe happened, and I don't think it can be proven otherwise.

The ACLU has already brought a lawsuit against Arizona, and the ACLU along with the SEIU, and just name your leftist organization in America. They all joined in common cause. They have made these arguments. This is a lawsuit filed May 17, 2010. Here's what the ACLU and the Muslim group here in America and the SEIU and others have brought suit on, against Arizona's immigration law 1070.

It says that it violates the Supremacy Clause. That's the preemption component of this. I don't know where and the suit doesn't say where, not that I have found.

It says it also violates the Equal Protection Clause. It argues that plaintiffs who are racially and national origin minorities, including Latinos residing or traveling in Arizona, might be targeted. It does make targets out of them is what it says. I would argue that the bill says that you can't use racial profiling, and so if the targets are breaking the law, you have to enforce the law no matter what their skin color is, Mr. Speaker. That's the ACLU's argument.

Another is it violates the First Amendment. I don't know what the logic is on that, and I won't trouble this Congress with that part.

But this goes on and says that it violates the Fourth Amendment against unreasonable search and seizure. Well, on what basis? I don't think it goes very deep into that.

□ 2230

And then due process, privileges and immunities, right to travel—people breaking the law don't have a right to travel in the United States, and it violates 42 U.S.C. 1981, which is, prohibits discrimination under color of State law on the basis of alienage, national origin, or race. Well, no, the law prohibits such a thing.

But here's what I'll predict to you, Mr. Speaker: When we finally see the litigation that the Department of Justice is seeking to bring against Arizona, we will see that it has been copied and pasted right off of the ACLU's lawsuit. That's the work that I believe is being done. The outside groups, the left-wing groups play the tune—the tune is right here in this lawsuit from

the ACLU—and then the Justice Department dances at the direction of the President of the United States, at the direction of the ACLU, the SEIU, and the rest of the left-wing organizations that have filed this lawsuit.

But this is not a rational approach. If the President can't articulate a problem, a constitutional violation—even though he taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago—the Attorney General, under oath, couldn't articulate a constitutional Federal statute or a case law violation by Arizona's immigration law, S. 1070, but yet, this radical case that I think is irrational and illogical that's brought by the ACLU—and this is just a summary, it's about that thick, and I've read a lot of it, actually—this will make sole theories of specious arguments, and I believe that the Justice Department—if they come forward, and I think they will—will be making those same irrational speeches, arguments.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about an unbiased Justice Department. It's hard for me to buy the idea that they are unbiased. When I look at this case, this all-out effort to focus on Arizona's immigration law and to invalidate it without a basis or a rationale, when I look at the many faces of the administration that have spoken against it that hadn't read the bill—Attorney General Holder, of course, would be the lead person that had admitted he hadn't read the bill. When Judge POE asked him that question shortly after my questions of the Attorney General that day, he admitted he hadn't read the bill. Seventeen pages, he hadn't read the bill.

He clearly had not been briefed by any objective person that had read the bill. He may have taken the MoveOn.org or the Huffington Post talking points and read them. It sounded to me like he had. It sounded to me like the President had as well. And then Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, who is charged with heading up the office that enforces immigration law, the former Governor of Arizona, who should have focused on that bill—well, Governor Jan Brewer should have focused on that bill more; I know she did. Senator Russell Pearce focused on 1070 a lot more; I know he did. But Janet Napolitano, a former Arizona Governor and now Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, had not read the bill, but still made public statements that implied, at a minimum, that it would bring about profiling of people in Arizona and disagreed with the law. And when JOHN MCCAIN point-blanked her before the Senate hearing, she had to admit she hadn't read the bill either.

The President didn't read the bill when he talked about the mother and her daughter going for ice cream; either that, or he willfully misinformed the American people. We know that Eric Holder didn't read the bill. He admitted to that under oath. We know

that Janet Napolitano didn't read the bill. She admitted that under oath. We go further down the line.

Michael Posner, the Assistant Secretary of State, he was so outraged by Arizona copying Federal's immigration law that he took the argument to the Chinese. We brought it up early and often, he said, apparently to compare Arizona's immigration law with the brutality that goes on in that brutal regime in China.

I don't think I'm done yet, Mr. Speaker. Let's see, who am I forgetting? Assistant Secretary John Morton, who heads up ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, who made the public statement that he wouldn't commit to cooperation with Arizona when it came to picking up the illegals that would be arrested by Arizona under S. 1070.

Now, John Morton doesn't get to set policy, neither does Janet Napolitano, nor does Eric Holder, nor does Assistant Secretary of State Michael Posner, nor the President of the United States; they have to work within the laws that they get. Now, there are other policies that they do get to set within the framework, but they don't get to amend the policy. Congress sets that. The voice of the American people sets it.

If John Morton, the head of ICE, doesn't want to enforce the law, if he doesn't want to pick up the illegals that are arrested by Arizona's law enforcement officers, then John Morton should just simply find himself a job that his heart was in. He should go do something that he could do that he believed was right if he disagrees with the policy. You know, a general that thinks we're off on the wrong mission will just resign their commission if they don't think they're getting the support from the political people, and that's happened a number of times throughout our history. When they get an order that they can't carry out, generals have just resigned. At least they maintain their integrity that way.

Well, there is an order out there, and it is, Enforce the law. Cooperate, by the way, with Arizona, who has uttered this almost a primal scream of despair and frustration that they've had to take their resources in their State and pass an immigration law that, by the way, I hope and plead goes to every State in the Union. If they can find ways to toughen it up, tighten it up and make it more effective, do that, but start with that foundation of Arizona's law. It's rare when a State takes an initiative that it begins to set the policy for America. I would be very happy to see this happen, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the case of Arizona.

So our Federal officials that got this wrong, that are trying to mirror, by the way, the President of the United States, but the President misinformed the American people. He hadn't read the bill. Janet Napolitano misinformed the American people. She hadn't read the bill. Eric Holder misinformed the

American people. He hadn't read the bill. I don't know if John Morton read the bill, but he didn't want to enforce the law, you could tell that. Now I actually think he has made some mitigating statements, and he will be better to get along with. Michael Posner had no business sticking his nose in this whatsoever, and he carried it all the way to negotiations with the Chinese under the State Department.

And by the way, I can't stand here in this place on the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, without raising an issue of Felipe Calderon, back behind where I'm standing now and before Memorial Day, spoke to a Joint Session of Congress, and he had to lecture us on how he strongly disagrees with Arizona's immigration law. Well, if he does, he also disagrees with the United States Federal Government's immigration law because that's what Arizona's law does; it mirrors it. It mirrors the Federal immigration law.

And so we're in an era where the administration, the highest ranking officials within the administration aren't compelled to check the facts before they misinform the American people. They might check a left-wing Web site, but they're not checking the facts. And the American people, who are they going to trust? Shouldn't they be able to trust the voice of the President of the United States? Who's briefing him? Who's telling him what's in the bill? Did they all decline to read the bill? Couldn't anyone have given him an objective analysis? What kind of a shop is being run at the White House in that regard? I think we're getting an indication.

And so, furthermore, while I talk about the immigration subject matter, there is another one out here that causes me reason to be concerned. It was reported in the news that President Obama's aunt was granted asylum—and I always have to check her name to make sure that I get it exactly right. Zeituni Onyango is President Obama's aunt, and she has lived in public housing—reported by the news, at least—in Boston for some time. I believe she came to the United States in the year 2000. We don't know necessarily how she got into the United States, whether it was on some type of a visa, whether it was a tourist or what it might have been, but she stayed. And along about the year 2002, she became the focus of the immigration law enforcement personnel. By 2004, his aunt, Zeituni Onyango, had been adjudicated for deportation by an immigration judge.

□ 2240

Well, she defied the deportation order. She stayed in the United States, purportedly on public benefits of a series of kinds. I don't know how she actually did that, but that's what the news has reported. Then not that long ago, after her nephew became President, she received asylum. Now, "asy-

lum," in this case, is the equivalent of amnesty for an individual, Mr. Speaker. So Zeituni Onyango, who, if she had honored the deportation order, would have left the United States and would have gone back to Kenya, stuck around here, and couldn't be deported or was not forcibly taken out of the United States. She defied the order, and now she is rewarded with the objective of her crime.

Remember when I said that the definition of "amnesty" is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and to reward them with the objectives of their crimes?

Well, it is a crime to come into the United States illegally. She may have overstayed a visa, in which case it puts her onto the civil side of this, but if her objective were to be able to stay in the United States, the asylum that she has been granted has come from a judge to whom she has argued that it is too dangerous for her to go back to Kenya because, now, the notoriety of being related to the President makes it too dangerous for her to go back and live there.

Well, if that's the case, if the President's aunt who lives in Kenya can't go back to Kenya because there is too much focus on her there, then I think there are a lot of the other relations of the President who are in Kenya who would be living under the same kind of fear. Wouldn't they get the same asylum if they came here to the United States? Is that something that the President is for, her getting asylum after the court had said "no," based on the fact that her nephew was elected President? Would that be a reason?

As I read that law, I have a lot of questions that come up, but one of them is: If his aunt gets asylum, then wouldn't all of the Obama relations get asylum if they just snuck into the United States? Maybe they can move onto the White House grounds. Then none of them can go back to Kenya anymore. I don't know. I think we should be concerned about whether there was favoritism involved. If a court would grant asylum with no greater basis than what I read here, then I think it is one that should be questioned.

Robert Gibbs said, no, there was nothing out of the ordinary, and there was no impropriety. No one from the White House had anything to say about that. They just let the court do what they did. Really? I would wonder if the administration would say the same thing about the bankruptcy court for General Motors and Chrysler. Yes, they have.

I happen to have thought about this to the point where I reached in, and I wanted to look at some of the testimony before the Judiciary Committee on hearings that took place some time back. I, actually, don't have this date in my record, but it is a matter of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This would be testimony of the Indiana State Treasurer, Treasurer Mourdock, who gave

some compelling testimony before the Judiciary Committee. I listened to a number of the witnesses testify on this similar theme. The theme was that the White House had dictated the terms of bankruptcy to the automakers. So I asked the question of Treasurer Mourdock:

Did any of that testimony that came before the bankruptcy court—"did any of that testimony alter the anticipated result of chapter 11?" Well, this was for both Chrysler and General Motors. Did it alter it? In other words, did the evidence that was presented to the bankruptcy court change the terms that had been offered to it by the White House?

Here is what Treasurer Mourdock said: "No, it did not." Now, that's a quote. "No, it did not."

I'll just embellish that a little bit and say his answer was this—and this is how I interpret the answer, is more accurate: the White House dictated the terms of bankruptcy to the bankruptcy court. Now, whenever in the history of America has the President of the United States determined the terms of bankruptcy and told a bankruptcy court this is how it will be?

Furthermore, to go on with Treasurer Mourdock's testimony—and being from Indiana, he was in the middle of this, and he was speaking only of the Chrysler industry, I should make it clear. He said this: "You had the situation where one party was negotiating, setting values, determining which creditors would be in, which ones would be out, what they would be given, what would be liquidated, all to be set up for an auction sale for which there was only one bidder—the United States Government. It was on both sides of the table simultaneously. The impropriety of that in trying to establish value for a sale goes beyond plausible."

That entire string comes out of his testimony. It says to me, and my conclusion is that he was a witness of this, that the Federal Government set the terms of bankruptcy, and when the testimony went before the chapter 11 bankruptcy court, the court had to make a determination. The determination was already made and offered to them. He said there was only one party negotiating, only one party setting values, determining which creditors got paid, which ones were the winners and the losers. There was one party that was offering shares over to the unions—that didn't have an interest in but they walked out of there with an interest in General Motors at least—of 17.5 percent of the shares. Yet this quote is about Chrysler, determining what they would be given, what would be liquidated, all to be set up for an auction sale for which there was only one bidder. That means the Federal Government, the United States Government, on both sides of the table simultaneously, bidding and receiving and dictating the terms to the bankruptcy court.

An administration that could do this we are to believe wouldn't find a way to provide amnesty and asylum for the aunt, Aunt Zeituni Onyango, who lives still in the United States and whom I've invited to testify before the Judiciary Committee?

This is not an obscure aunt of President Obama's. I've read his book, "Dreams from My Father," and this is the aunt who was his guide when he visited Kenya. I believe the year was 1988. President Obama writes extensively about his trip to Kenya. It was a transformative or at least it was a very enlightening experience for him, according to his book, which I take at face value. I know that it was fiction, at least in part, but it was based upon fact.

So I went through it the other night and searched to take a look as to when this subject matter came up. I thought, well, maybe he made just a light reference to his aunt in the book. So I went through and counted the references to his aunt, who now has received asylum in the United States after defying a deportation order. President Obama mentions Aunt Onyango 66 times in his book "Dreams from My Father"—66 times. She took him to place after place. Almost everywhere he went in Kenya, she was the one who took him there. His impressions of Kenya were delivered to him through her.

It is not conceivable to me that an aunt who is that close to him would have come to the United States without his knowledge, nor is it conceivable to me that an aunt who lived in the United States in public housing, presumably under public benefits—and I don't know how those terms were reached and how that could have happened—nor is it conceivable to me that an aunt could have gone to an immigration court and could have been adjudicated for deportation and could have escaped the knowledge or the awareness of Barack Obama. It's not conceivable.

It is not conceivable to me that a President can dictate the terms of bankruptcy to General Motors and to Chrysler and can take the shares away from the secured creditors, who are the people who should be first in line to receive the benefits or to receive any liquidation or any purchase or settlement of the automakers General Motors and Chrysler, and can ice them out, box them out, and give them nothing and hand shares of the automakers over to the unions that had no investment in and no collateral hold on those companies. It has mirrored the language exactly out of the Democratic Socialists of America, off the Socialist Web site.

If all of that can happen—and it has happened, and some of the evidence I've read into the RECORD here tonight, Mr. Speaker—it is not conceivable to me that this amnesty/asylum for President Obama's aunt happened independent from the influence of the White House. Perhaps show us the

records. Let's open up the case. Let's see.

By the way, Attorney General Holder, let's see your draft complaint that you've prepared now to bring the suit against Arizona. When that draft complaint is released—and I formally requested that as a document—I will take it myself and go into the ACLU's lawsuit, and I'll show you where the Attorney General's office copied and pasted right of the ACLU's lawsuit into their own. It will be what comes from that draft complaint.

I know it's coming. That's how they're operating. They're not operating independently within that operation. They've been politicized. They have canceled the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of America, which is the New Black Panthers' case in Philadelphia. It is on videotape. They had a conviction. All they needed to do was to follow through. They canceled the case. Loretta King did so inside the Justice Department. Her name rings back to me because she is the one who canceled the will of the people in Kinston, North Carolina, who voted that they wanted no more partisan elections in local elections. They wanted to take the "R" and the "D" off the names of the candidates; and with a 70 percent vote, Loretta King invalidated that because she said, Well, black people won't know to vote for another black person unless there is a "D" beside his name.

That is not equal protection. It is contempt for people's judgment. I think we need to have equal protection under the law. We need to uphold the Constitution, the rule of law and the separation of powers.

I am going to stand with the people of Arizona, who have done a great thing for America; and we are eventually going to get to the point where we establish this rule of law and enforce our immigration laws. When that becomes a practice in the United States of America, then we can talk about some of the other solutions when it comes to immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention this evening, your indulgence and the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family business.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and until 5 p.m. on June 15 on account of illness.

Mr. INSLEE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. GERLACH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending his daughter's high school graduation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, June 18.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 18 and 21.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 18 and 21.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, June 15 and 17.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3473. An act to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to authorize advances from Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 2010, at 9 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend

the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

TOM GRAVES, Georgia, Ninth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7861. A letter from the Lead Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Swine Contract Library (RIN: 0580-AB06) received May 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7862. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium 1,4-Dialkyl Sulfo succinates; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0739; FRL-8825-2] received June 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7863. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a letter regarding the clean energy goals of the administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7864. A letter from the Chair, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's 96th Annual Report covering operations for calendar year 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7865. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Web-Based Compliance and Certification Management System [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-CRT-0017] (RIN: 1904-AC10) received May 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7866. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Determination Concerning the Potential for Energy Conservation Standards for Non-Class A External Power Supplies [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-DET-0005] (RIN: 1904-AB80) received May 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7867. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Withdrawal of the Emission-Comparable Fuel Exclusion under RCRA [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2005-0017; FRL-9160-9] (RIN: 2050-AG57) received June 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7868. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's "Major" final rule — Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Sulfur Dioxide [EPA-HQ-OAR-2007-0352; FRL-9160-4] (RIN: 2060-A048) received June 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7869. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 09-141 Certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7870. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-039, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7871. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-014, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7872. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7873. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Incorporation of Special Permits into Regulations [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0289 (HM-233A)] (RIN: 2137-AE39) received May 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7874. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A300 B2-1C, B2-203, B2K-3C, B4-103, B4-203, B4-2C Airplanes; Model A310 Series Airplanes; and Model A300 B4-601, B4-603, B4-605R, B4-620, B4-622, and B4-622R Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0789; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-16228; AD 2010-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7875. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives BAE SYSTEMS (Operations) Limited Model BAE 146-100A, -200A, and -300A Series Airplanes, and Model Avro 146-RJ70A, 146-RJ85A, and 146-RJ100A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1250; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-169-AD; Amendment 39-16276; AD 2010-09-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7876. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives: DASSAULT AVIATION Model FALCON 900EX and MYSTERE-FALCON 900 Airplanes [Docket No.: 2000-NM-418-AD; Amendment 39-12964; AD 2002-23-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7877. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service,

transmitting the Service's final rule — Sections 7701(a) and 7805 — Definition of Foreign Partnership [Notice 2010-41] received May 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7878. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — James R. Thompson v. United States Court of Federal Claims No. 06-211T received May 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7879. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tide-water Inc. and Subsidiaries and Tidewater Foreign Sales Corporation v. United States, 565 F. 3d 299 (5th Cir. 2009), aff'g No. 06-875, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 77147 (E.D. La. October 17, 2007) received May 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7880. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Nonpersonal Use Vehicles [TD 9483] (RIN: 1545-BH65) received May 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7881. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of Dividends received Deduction on Separate Accounts of Life Insurance Companies [LMSB-4-0510-015] received May 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7882. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report on "Wiretapping and the War on Terror"; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

7883. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled, "Unemployment Compensation Program Integrity Act of 2010"; jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

7884. A letter from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, Financial Services, Small Business, Transportation and Infrastructure, Veterans' Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce.

7885. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a legislative proposal to be a part of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TOWNS: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2142. A bill to require the review of Government programs at least once every 5 years for purposes of assessing their performance and improving their operations, and to establish the Performance Improvement Council; with amendments (Rept. 111-504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4451. A bill to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; with an amendment (Rept. 111-505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1436. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5486) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-506). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. CAO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 5519. A bill to terminate the moratorium on deepwater drilling and to require the Secretary of the Interior to ensure the safety of deepwater drilling operations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAGEN (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HARE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BACA, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5520. A bill to require immediate payment by BP p.l.c. to the United States of an amount for use to compensate all affected persons for removal costs and damages arising from the explosion and sinking of the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon, to make that amount available to the Secretary of the Interior to pay such compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 5521. A bill to extend credits related to the production of electricity from offshore wind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 5522. A bill to amend chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and authorization of funding for certain training programs for supervisors of Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REYES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. HARE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. JONES, Mr. CAO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BUYER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 235th birthday of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution recognizing Associated Builders and Contractors on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of its founding and for the many vital contributions merit shop commercial, industrial, and infrastructure construction contractors make to the quality of life of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MORAN of Vir-

ginia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HILL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SIREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DJOU (for himself and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 1435. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should initiate negotiations to enter into a free trade agreement with the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas:

H. Res. 1437. A resolution congratulating the McLennan Community College Highlanders men's golf team for winning the 2010 NJCAA Division I Men's Golf Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H. Res. 1438. A resolution promoting increased awareness and diagnosis of peripheral arterial disease (PAD) to address the high mortality rate of this treatable disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. TERRY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KIRK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. BEAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H. Res. 1439. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2010 Stanley Cup Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WEINER:

H. Res. 1440. A resolution recognizing and supporting Israel's right to defend itself; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

306. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2009 urging the Congress to enact legislation that provides grant funding for states to conduct feasibility studies for the domestic production and research of medical isotopes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

307. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 927 urging the Congress to pass the Social Security Fairness Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2014 urging the Congress to support federal and state policy initiatives to spur a new wave of nuclear plant development; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Science and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 52: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 211: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 235: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 248: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 406: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 503: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 635: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 669: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 707: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 948: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1021: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1193: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1210: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1230: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1240: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1305: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1324: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1351: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
H.R. 1549: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1806: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1826: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1829: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1927: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1956: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2246: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2626: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 2697: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2731: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2746: Mr. UPTON and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 2811: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3164: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3212: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3349: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 3408: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3441: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 3464: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 3491: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3554: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 3625: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3716: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3839: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3974: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4051: Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 4080: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4116: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 4128: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4148: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4190: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 4195: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 4197: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4296: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4322: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4446: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4480: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 4530: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4544: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4594: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4638: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4671: Mr. POLIS and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 4677: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4684: Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 4710: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4745: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4796: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4830: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4844: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4886: Mr. TURNER and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4910: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 4912: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4923: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4925: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4926: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4995: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 5012: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 5032: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5034: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 5040: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 5041: Mr. OWENS and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 5081: Mr. LINDER and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5092: Mr. SPRATT.
H.R. 5119: Mr. POLIS and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 5141: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 5156: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5162: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5173: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 5211: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5232: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5339: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 5340: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 5354: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5355: Ms. WATERS and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5382: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 5426: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 5434: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 5441: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 5470: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 5478: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 5480: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 5501: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. CAO.
H.R. 5502: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 5510: Mr. DRIEHAUS.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.J. Res. 81: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WATT.
H. Con. Res. 242: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. BARROW, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. KILROY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H. Res. 111: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. CRITZ.
H. Res. 173: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 536: Mr. AKIN and Mr. HOLDEN.
H. Res. 764: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 820: Mr. MANZULLO.
H. Res. 913: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Res. 966: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 1171: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 1207: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 1219: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H. Res. 1291: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Res. 1350: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. FLAKE.
H. Res. 1401: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WU, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. CAO, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H. Res. 1406: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. FLEMING.
H. Res. 1412: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 1417: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 1429: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CAO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H. Res. 1430: Mr. SABLAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

144. The SPEAKER presented a petition of American Bar Association, Illinois, relative to Resolution 102G urging the President and the Attorney General to assure that lawyers in the Department of Justice do not make decisions concerning investigations or proceedings based upon partisan political interests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. Also, a petition of American Bar Association, Illinois, relative to Resolution 102D urging federal, state, local, and territorial courts to adopt a procedure whereby a criminal trial court shall conduct a conference with the parties to ensure that they are fully aware of their respective disclosure obligations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.